

BROWNSON'S
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1845.

ART. 1. — *The Christian Examiner and Religious Miscellany*, January, 1845. Art. VI. *The Church*.

THE Journal, the title of which we have here quoted, is the ably conducted organ of the American Unitarians. As a periodical, it is one in which we take no slight interest ; for it is conducted by our personal friends, and through its pages, which were liberally opened to us, we were at one time accustomed to give circulation to our own crude speculations and pestilential heresies. We introduce it to our readers, however, not for the purpose of expressing any general opinion of its character, or the peculiar tenets of the denomination of which it is the organ ; but solely for the purpose of using the article which appeared in the January number, headed *The Church*, as a text for some remarks in defence of the Church against the prevalent No-Churchism of our age and community.

In our Review for October last, we refuted the pretensions of the High-Church Episcopalians ; in the last number, in the article on *The British Reformers*, we refuted Low-Churchism : we attempt now a refutation of No-Churchism, or the doctrine which admits the Church in name, but denies it in fact. All Protestant sects, just in proportion as they depart from Catholic unity, tend to No-Churchism ; and our Unitarians, who are the Protestants of Protestants, and who afford us a practical exemplification of what Protestantism is and must be, when and where it has the sense, the honesty, or the courage to be consequent, have already reached this important point. They cannot be said, in the legitimate sense of the word, to believe in any Church at all. They see clearly enough, that, if they once

admit a Church at all, in any sense in which it is distinguishable from No-Church, they can neither justify the Reformers in seceding from the Catholic Church, nor themselves in remaining aliens from its communion. They have, therefore, the honesty and boldness to deny the Church altogether, and to admit in its place only a voluntary association of individuals for pious and religious purposes ; in which sense it is on a par with a Bible, Missionary, Temperance, or Abolition society, with scarcely any thing more holy in its objects, or more binding on its members.

The *Examiner*, in the article we have referred to, fully authorizes this statement ; and though it by no means discards the sacred name of Church, it leaves us nothing venerable or worth contending for to be signified by it. The controversies, for the next few years, it thinks, will, not improbably, revolve around the question of the Church. "What, then," it asks, "is the Church ? what is its authority ? what its importance ? what its true place among Christian ideas or influences ?" These are the questions ; and its purpose in the article under consideration is to offer a few remarks which may indicate a true answer to them, especially the last.

In answer to the question, What is the Church ? the writer replies, "It is the whole company of believers, the uncounted and wide-spread congregation of all those who receive the Gospel as the law of life. It is coextensive with Christianity ; it is the living Christianity of the time, be that more or less, be it expressed in one mode of worship or another, in one or another variety of internal discipline. The Church of Christ comprehends and is composed of all his followers." — pp. 78, 79.

The answer to the question, What is the importance of the Church ? is not very clearly set forth. Perhaps this is a point on which the writer has not yet attained to clear and distinct views. It is, probably, one of those points on which "more light is to break forth." The *place* of the Church among Christian ideas and influences is also not very definitely determined ; but it would appear, according to the *Examiner*, that the sacred writers had two ideas,—for they were not, like our modern reformers, men of only one idea,—and these two ideas were, one the Church, the other the individual soul. We do not mean to say that the writer really intends to teach that the Church is an *idea*, for a "company of believers" can hardly be called an *idea*, nor can the individual soul ; but he probably means to teach that the sacred writers had two ideas, or

rather two points of view, from which they contemplated this company of believers,—the one collective, the other individual.

“They loved to collect—in idea—the members of Christ, as *they styled them*, under one idea, and present them in this relation of unity to their readers. Thus viewed, the Church became the *emblem* of Christian influences and Christian benefits. It expressed all Christ had lived for, or died for. He had loved it, and given himself for it. It was ‘the pillar and ground of the truth.’ It was ‘the body’ of which he was the head.”—p. 79.

This unity, however, is purely ideal. The only unity really existing consists merely in the similar sentiments, hopes, and aims of the individual members. But

“There was another idea on which the Apostles insisted still more strenuously, that of the individual soul. They taught the importance of the individual soul. Around this, as the one object of interest, were gathered the revelations and commandments of the Gospel. Personal responsibility—in view of privileges, duties, sins, temptations—was their great theme. They preached the Gospel to the soul in its individual exposure and want. It is the peculiarity of our religion, its vital peculiarity, that it makes the individual the object of its address, its immediate and its final action. Christianity divested of this distinction becomes powerless, and void of meaning. It contradicts and subverts itself.”—*Ib.*

Here, then, are two ideas,—the idea of the *company*, and the idea of the *individual*; and the first idea is to be held subordinate to the second; which, we suppose, means that the end of Christianity is the redemption and sanctification of the individual soul, and that the Church is to be valued only in so far as it is a means to this end,—a doctrine which we do not recollect ever to have heard questioned. The *place* of the Church is, therefore, below the individual, and being only the effect of the operation of Christianity in the hearts of individuals, as the writer further on tells us, its importance must consist solely in the reaction of the example of Christians on those not yet converted, and in the aid and encouragement union among professed Christians gives to one another in their strivings after the Christian life. This, as near as we can come at it, is the *Examiner's* doctrine.

The writer throws in one or two remarks, in connexion with his general statement, to which we cannot assent. “It has been maintained,” he says, “that the Church is the principal idea in the Gospel. It has been *generally* supposed that the individual exists for the Church. Ecclesiastical writers have

contended, and the people have admitted, that the rights of the Church were stronger than the rights of the members, that the prosperity of the Church must be secured at the expense of the believer's peace and independence ; that, in a word, every thing must be made to yield to the Church."—p. 80. The writer must have drawn on his imagination for this. Ecclesiastical writers have never contended, nor have the people admitted, any such thing. Certainly, so far as our reading extends, the doctors of the Church have always and uniformly taught that the Church exists for the individual, not the individual for the Church, and that she is to be submitted to solely as the means in the hands of God of redeeming and sanctifying the individual soul. This is wherefore Churchmen so earnestly contend for the Church, so willingly obey its commands, and so cheerfully lay down their lives in its defence.

The question of a conflict of rights between the Church and the individual, which the *Examiner* regards as *the* great question of the age, is no question at all ; for there never is and never can be a conflict of rights. It has never been held by any one of any authority in the ecclesiastical world, that the *rights* of the Church are stronger than the *rights* of the members, and that the rights of the members must yield to those of the Church. Rights never yield ; claims may yield, but not rights. Establish the fact that this or that is the right of the member, and the Church both respects and guaranties it ; nay, the Church goes farther, and presumes the rights she cannot vindicate to herself to be the property of the individual. But where the Church has the right to teach and command, she does not come in conflict with individual rights by demanding submission, for there the individual has no rights. To hold him, within the province of the Church, to obedience, is only holding him to obedience to the rightful authority. When the law says to the individual, "Thou shalt not steal," it infringes no right ; because the individual has not, and never had, any right to steal. It is sometimes a convenience to be acquainted with the views of those we wish to oppose.

But, passing over this, we may say, the *Examiner* holds, that, in the usual sense of the term, our blessed Saviour founded no church ; he merely taught the truth, and, by his teaching, life, sufferings, death, and resurrection, deposited in the minds and hearts of men certain great seminal principles of truth and goodness, to be by their own free thought and affection developed and matured. The Church is nothing but the mere effect

of the development and growth of these principles. "It is but a consequence" of the effect of Christianity upon those who are "separately brought under its influence." These, taken collectively, are the Church. These organize themselves in one way or another, adopt for their social regulation and mutual progress such forms of worship or internal discipline as are suggested by the measure of Christian truth and virtue realized in their hearts. This is all the Church there is. If you ask, What is its authority? the answer is, "A fiction, a fiction which has cheated millions and ruined multitudes, but a fiction still."—p. 83. This, in brief, is the church theory of *Liberal* Christians, and, in point of fact, the theory virtually adopted by the great body of the Protestant world, and the only theory a consistent Protestant can adopt, if not even more than he can adopt without losing his consistency. The insufficiency of this theory it is our purpose in the following essay to point out, by showing that with it alone it is impossible to elicit an act of faith. We shall begin what we have to offer by defining what it is we mean by the Church, and what are the precise questions at issue between Catholics and No-Churchmen. We do this, because the *Examiner* and its associates do not seem to have any clear or definite notions of what it is Catholics contend for, when they contend for the authority, infallibility, and indefectibility of the Church, nor what it is of which we really predicate these important attributes.

The word *church*, it is well known, is used in a variety of senses. The Greek *ἐκκλησία*, *ecclesia*, rendered by the word *church*, taken in a general way, means an assembly, or congregation, whether good or bad, for one purpose or another; but is for the most part taken in the Sacred Scriptures and the Fathers in a good sense, for the Church of Christ. The English word *church*, said to be derived from *Κύριος* and *οἶκος*, *the Lord's house*, would seem to designate primarily the place of worship; but as *οἶκος*, like our English word *house*, may mean the family as well as the dwelling or habitation, the word *church* may not improperly be used to designate the Lord's family, the worshippers as well as the place of worship; in which sense it is a sufficiently accurate translation of the Greek *ἐκκλησία*, as generally used by ecclesiastical writers.

1. By the Church we understand, then, when taken in its widest sense, without any limitation of space or time, the whole of the Lord's family, the whole congregation of the faithful,

united in the true worship of God under Christ the head. In this sense it comprehends the faithful of the Old Testament,—not only those belonging to the Synagogue, but also those out of it, as Job, Melchisedech, &c.,—the blest, even the angels, in heaven, the suffering in purgatory, and those on the way. As comprehending the blest in heaven, it is called the Church Triumphant; the souls in purgatory, the Church Suffering; believers on the way, the Church Militant; not that these are three different Churches, but different parts, or rather states, of one and the same Church. But with the Church in this comprehensive sense we have in our present discussion no concern. Our question obviously turns on the Church Militant.

2. The Church Militant is defined by Catholic writers to be “The society of the faithful, baptized in the profession of the same faith, united in the participation of the same sacraments, and in the same worship, under one head, Christ in heaven, and his vicar, the sovereign pontiff, on earth.” But even this is too comprehensive for our present question,—to indicate at once the precise points in the controversy between Catholics and their adversaries.

3. We must distinguish, in the Church Militant, between the *Ecclesia credens*, the congregation of the faithful, and the *Ecclesia docens*, or congregation of pastors and teachers.

The Church, as the simple congregation of believers, taken exclusively as *believers*, is not a visible organization, nor an authoritative or an infallible body. On this point we have no controversy with the *Examiner*; for we are no Congregationalists, and by no means disposed to maintain that the supreme authority in the Church, under Christ, is vested in the body of the faithful. The authority of the Church in this sense we cheerfully admit is “a fiction,” “a mischievous fiction,” as the history of Protestantism for these three hundred years of its existence sufficiently establishes.

When we contend for the Church as a visible, authoritative, infallible, and indefectible body or corporation, we take the word *church* in a restricted sense, to mean simply the body of pastors and teachers, or, in other words, the bishops in communion with their chief. We mean what Protestants would, perhaps, better understand by the word *ministry* than by the word *church*,—although this word *ministry* is far from being exact, as it designates functions rather than functionaries, and, when used to designate functionaries, includes the several orders of the Christian priesthood,—not merely the bishops or

pastors, who alone, according to the Catholic view, constitute the *Ecclesia docens*. Nevertheless, to avoid the confusion the word *church* is apt to generate in Protestant minds, we shall sometimes use it, merely premising that we use it to express only the body of pastors and teachers, by whom we understand exclusively the bishops.

Now, the question between us and the No-Churchmen turns precisely on this *Ecclesia docens*. Has our blessed Saviour established a body of teachers for his Church, — that is, for the congregation of the faithful? Has he given them authority to teach and govern? Has he given to this body the promise of infallibility and indefectibility? If so, which of the pretended Christian ministries now extant is this body? These are the questions between us and No-Churchmen, and they cover the whole ground in controversy. On each of these questions they assert the negative, and we maintain the affirmative. To show that the negative cannot be maintained, and that the affirmative must be, and can, is our present purpose. There is now no mistaking the points to be discussed.

I. We take it for granted that the writer in the *Examiner* admits, or intends to admit, the divine origin and authority of the Christian religion, and that the name of Jesus is the only name “given under heaven among men whereby we must be saved.” We shall take it for granted that he holds the Christian religion to be not merely preferable to all other religions or pretended religions, but the only true religion and way of salvation. We are bound to do so, for he is a doctor of divinity, a professedly Christian pastor of a professedly Christian congregation, and it would be discourteous on our part to reason with him as we would with a Jew, Pagan, Mahometan, or Infidel. We are bound to assume that he holds, or at least intends to hold, that the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ is the only law of life, without obedience to which no one can be saved; and, since he makes Christianity and the Church coextensive, that out of the pale of the Church, *as he defines it*, there is no salvation. The Church, he says, comprehends and is composed of all the followers of Christ. No one, then, who is not in the Church is a follower of Christ. If the Gospel of Christ be the only law of life, no one not a follower of Christ can be saved. Consequently, no one not a member of the Church of Christ can be saved.

To deny this is to reject Christianity altogether, or to fall

into complete indifferency. If men can be saved, or be acceptable to their Maker, in one religion as well as in another, wherein is one preferable to another? If the Christian revelation was not necessary to our salvation, why was it given us, and why are we called upon to believe and obey it? why did God send his only begotten Son to make it, and why was it declared to be of such inestimable value to us? If Jesus taught that salvation is attainable in all religions, or in any religion but his own, why were the Apostles so enraptured with the Gospel, and why did they make such painful sacrifices for its promulgation? If they had not been taught to regard it as the only way of salvation, their conduct is unaccountable; and if it be not the only way of salvation, they and their Master can be regarded only as a company of deluded fanatics, whose labors, sacrifices, and cruel deaths may indeed excite our pity, but cannot command our respect. We shall presume the writer in the *Examiner* sees all this as well as we, and therefore shall presume that he holds with us, that all mankind are bound to worship God, that there is but one true way of worshipping God, and therefore but one true religion, and that this true religion is the Christian religion. He who does not admit this much can hardly, by any allowable stretch of courtesy, be called a Christian. This premised, we proceed.

1. In order to be saved, to enter into life, or to become acceptable to God, one must be a Christian. To be a Christian, one must be a *believer*. No one is a Christian who is not a follower of Christ. Every follower of Christ, according to the *Examiner*, is a member of the Church of Christ. But, according to the same authority, the Church is a company of *believers*. Therefore a Christian must be a believer. He who is a believer is a believer because he believes something. Therefore, in order to be a Christian, it is necessary to believe something.

The *Examiner* must admit this conclusion; yet some Unitarians have the appearance of denying it. A short time since, we read an article in a Unitarian newspaper in this city, written by a distinguished Unitarian clergyman, in which the writer maintains, that, although faith is indispensable to the Christian character, belief is not; yet he fails to define what that faith is which excludes or does not include belief. Dr. Channing, in his *Discourse on the Church* objects to all forms, creeds, and churches, and declares that the essence of all religion is in supreme love to God and universal justice and charity towards our neighbour. Yet we presume he wishes this fact, to wit,

that this is the essence of all religion, should be assented to both by the will and the understanding. But this is not a fact of science, evident in and of itself. It depends on other facts which are matters of belief, and therefore must itself, as to its matter, if not as to its form, be an object of belief. Not a few Unitarian clergymen of our acquaintance understand by faith *trust* or *confidence* (*fiducia*), and contend, that, when we are commanded to *believe* in Christ, in God, &c., the meaning is that we should *trust* or *confide* in him. To believe in the Son is to confide in him as the Son of God. But I cannot confide in him as the Son of God, unless I believe that he is the Son of God ; I cannot confide in God, unless I believe that he is, and that he is a protector of them that trust him. Where there is no belief, there is and can be no confidence. Confidence always presupposes faith ; for where there is no belief that the trust reposed will be responded to, there is no trust ; and the fact, that the one trusted will preserve and not betray the trust, is necessarily a matter of faith, belief, not of knowledge. Faith begets confidence, but is not it ; confidence is the effect or concomitant of faith, but can never exist without it. So, however these may seem to deny the necessity of belief, they all in reality imply it, presuppose it.

Moreover, all Unitarians hold, that, to be a Christian, one must be a follower of Christ. Their radical conception of Christ is that of a teacher, of a person specially raised up and commissioned by Almighty God to teach, and to teach the truth. But one cannot be said to be the follower of a teacher, unless he believes what the teacher teaches. Therefore, to be a Christian, one must be a believer.

This, again, is evident from the Holy Scriptures. "For without faith," says the blessed Apostle Paul, "it is impossible to please God." Heb. xi. 6. So our blessed Saviour : "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved ; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." St. Mark, xvi. 16. "He that believeth in the Son hath eternal life ; but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life ; but the wrath of God abideth on him." St. John, iii. 36. This is sufficient to establish our first position, namely, that, in order to be a Christian, it is necessary to be a believer, that is, to believe *somewhat*.

2. This *somewhat*, which it is necessary to believe, is not falsehood, but truth. What we are required to believe is that for not believing which we shall be condemned. But God is a God of truth, nay, truth itself, and it is repugnant to

reason to assume that he will condemn us for not believing falsehood. The belief demanded is also essential to our salvation ; for it is said, " He that believeth not shall be condemned." But it is equally repugnant to reason to maintain that a God of truth, who is truth, can make belief in falsehood essential to salvation. Therefore the belief demanded, as to its object (*objectum materiale*), is truth, not falsehood.

3. The truth we are required to believe is the revelation which Almighty God has made us through his Son, Jesus Christ, or, in other words, the truth which Jesus Christ taught or revealed. The belief in question is *Christian* belief, that which makes one a Christian believer, a follower of Jesus, a member of the "uncounted and wide-spread congregation of all those who receive the Gospel as the law of life." But one can be a *Christian* believer only by believing Christian truth ; and Christian truth can be no other truth, if different truths there be, than that taught by Jesus Christ. Therefore the truth to be believed is the truth taught by Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ, according to the confession of Unitarians themselves, was a teacher of truth, and a teacher of nothing but truth. Then all he taught was truth. Therefore, to be truly a Christian believer, truly a follower of Christ, it is necessary to believe, explicitly or implicitly, *all* the truth he taught. Hence, the commission to the Apostles was to teach all nations, and to teach them to observe *all things whatsoever* their Master had commanded them. St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

4. The truth which Jesus Christ taught or revealed appertains, in part, at least, to the *supernatural* order. By the supernatural order we understand the order above nature, that is, above the order of creation. All beings, whether brute matter, vegetables, animals, men, or angels, are in God, and without him could neither be, live, nor move. But God has created them all "after their kinds," and each with a specific nature. What is included in this nature, or promised by it, although having its origin and first motion in God, is what is meant by *natural*. Supernatural is something above this, and superadded. God transcends nature, and is supernatural ; but regarded solely as the author, upholder, and governor of nature, he is natural, and hence the knowledge of him as such is always termed *natural theology*. But as the author of grace, he is strictly supernatural ; because grace, though having the same origin, is above the order of creation, is not included in it, nor promised by it. It is, so to speak, an excess of the Divine

Fulness not exhausted in creation, but reserved to be super-added to it according to the Divine will and pleasure. Thus God may be said to be both natural and supernatural. As natural, that is, as the author, sustainer, and governor of nature, he is naturally cognoscible, according to what Saint Paul tells us, Rom. i. 20. *Invisibilia enim ipsius, a creatura mundi, per ea quæ facta sunt, intellecta, conspiciuntur; sempiterna quoque ejus virtus, et Divinitas:* "For the invisible things of God, even his eternal power and Divinity, are clearly seen from the creation of the world, being understood by the things that are made." But as supernatural, that is, as the author of grace, he is not naturally cognoscible, and can be known only as supernaturally revealed. The fact that he is the author of grace, or that there is grace, is not a fact of natural reason, or intrinsically evident to natural reason. It, therefore, is not and cannot be a matter of science, but must be a matter of faith. Hence, the Apostle says again, Heb. xi. 6, *Credere enim oportet accedentem ad Deum quia est, et inquirentibus se remuneratorem se:* "He that cometh to God must *believe* that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek him." That he is as author of nature we *know*, but that he is as author of grace, or that he is a rewarder of them that seek him, we *believe*.

Now, the revelation of Jesus Christ is preëminently the revelation of God as the author and dispenser of grace, and therefore preëminently the revelation of the supernatural. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth by Jesus Christ." St. John, i. 17. Hence, to believe the truth and all the truth which Jesus Christ taught is to believe in truth pertaining to the supernatural order.

Unitarians, it is true, eliminate from the Gospel a great part of the mysteries, and reduce the Gospel; so to speak, to a mere republication of the law of nature; their theology is in the main natural theology; their faith in God is in him as the author of nature, and the immortality they look for merely a natural immortality; but the sounder part of them, among whom we reckon the writer of the article in the *Examiner*, do, nevertheless, to some extent, admit that Jesus revealed truths not naturally cognoscible, and which pertain also to the supernatural order. They admit that the Gospel is itself, in some sense, a revelation of grace, and therefore a revelation of the supernatural. They also admit the necessity, in order to be Christian believers, of believing in several particular things which pertain to the supernatural order. Among these we may instance

remission of sins, the resurrection of the dead, and final beatitude, or the heavenly reward. We are not aware that they question these ; and we are sure no one can question them without losing all right to the Christian name. But these all pertain to the supernatural order.

Remission of sin, whatever else it may mean, means at least remission of the penalty which God has annexed to transgression. The penalty is annexed by God as author and sovereign of nature, or it is annexed by him as supernatural. If by God in that sense in which he transcends nature, the penalty must itself be supernatural ; and therefore he who believes in its remission must believe in the supernatural, for no man can believe in the remission of a penalty which he does not believe to exist. If God annexes the penalty as author and sovereign of nature, it is in the order of nature, and then its *remission* must be supernatural ; for the remission cannot be in the order of nature, since it supersedes that order. To assume that the order of nature remits it, is to assume nature to be in contradiction with herself, or to deny the remission by denying the existence of any penalty to remit. Where the remission begins, there ends the penalty. If the remission be in the order of nature, then the order of nature imposes no penalty beyond the point where the remission begins ; and then there is no remission, for nothing is remitted. To say that God as author and sovereign of nature remits what in the same character he imposes is to assume that he imposes no penalty that goes farther than the commencement of the remission. Then, in fact, no remission. The penalty, in this case, would be exhausted, not remitted. Remission, then, must be by God as supernatural, not as natural ; not as author and sovereign of nature, but as author and dispenser of grace. Remission is necessarily an act of grace, and therefore supernatural. Then, whatever view be taken of the penalty itself, he who believes in its remission must believe in the supernatural order.

So of the resurrection of the dead. We do not mean to say that by natural reason we cannot demonstrate a future continued existence, but that a fact answering to the term *resurrection* is naturally neither cognoscible nor demonstrable. Resurrection means rising again, and evidently pertains, not to the soul, which never dies, but to the body, and implies that the same body which died is raised ; for if not, it would not be a *re-surrection*, but a simple *surrection*, or perhaps creation. Now, by no natural light we possess can we come to the knowledge

of the fact that our bodies shall rise again. Yet we are taught in the Gospel that such is the fact. We are assured that we shall live again. But we *live* only as united to the body ; for the Lord God formed man a body out of the dust of the earth, before he pronounced him a *living* soul. The souls of the departed doubtless exist ; but they are not living again in the full sense of the term, and will not so live till united anew to the body.

Moreover, the Apostle Paul tells us that the body shall not only be raised, but it shall be raised in a supernatural condition. "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." It is to be made like to our blessed Saviour's glorious body. But a glorified body does not pertain to the order of nature ; because the natural body, it is said, is to be "*made* like to the body of his glory," which implies that it must be changed from its natural to a supernatural condition, before it is a glorified body. But by what natural powers we possess do we arrive at the fact that there are glorified bodies, much more, that our vile bodies shall be changed into glorified bodies ? And by what process of reasoning, not dependent for its *data* on the revelation, can we, now we are told it shall be so, prove that it will be so ?

So, again, as to our final destiny. The truth we are to believe pertains to the supernatural order. St. Peter says, "By whom (Jesus Christ) he hath given us very great and precious promises, that by these you may be made partakers of the Divine nature,"—*efficiamini divinæ consortes naturæ*. 2 Pet. i. 4. That this is to partake of the divine nature in a supernatural sense, and not in the sense in which we naturally partake of it, in being made to the image and likeness of God, is evident from the fact that the Apostle calls it a *gift*, and says it is that which is *promised*. What pertains to nature is not a *gift*, and what is already possessed cannot be said to be something *promised*. Therefore the participation of the divine nature in question is not a natural, but a supernatural, participation. The blessed Apostle John tells us, "We are now the sons of God, and it hath not yet appeared what we shall be. We know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, because we shall see him as he is." 1 John iii. 2. Here it is asserted that we are to be something more than sons of God in the sense we now are ; for we know not, even being sons of God, what we shall be. But this we do know, that when he shall appear we shall be *like him*. But this likeness is supernatural, not

that to which we were created ; otherwise it would be a likeness *possessed*, not *to be* possessed. How by the light of nature learn this fact, that we are to become like God, partakers of the Divine nature, in a supernatural sense ? Again, the blessed Apostle in the same passage says, " We shall be like him, because we shall see him as he is." So St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiii. 12 : " Now we see through a glass, darkly, but then face to face ; now I know in part, but then I shall know even as I am known." Now the fact here asserted, to wit, that our future destiny is the beatific vision, that is, to see God as he is, and to know him even as we ourselves are known, is not naturally cognoscible, nor demonstrable by natural reason. Moreover, to see God as he is exceeds our nature ; for naturally we cannot see God as he is, that is, in himself ; we can see him only indirectly, obscurely, in part, in his works, as we see the cause in the effect. The destiny, then, which the Gospel reveals for them that love the Lord is supernatural. For " It is written, The eye hath not seen, ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love him." 1 Cor. ii. 9. Therefore, to believe the Gospel, or the truth which Jesus Christ taught, it is necessary to believe not only truth supernaturally communicated, but truth pertaining to the supernatural order. But we have already proved that it is necessary to salvation to believe *the* truth and *all* the truth which Jesus taught. Therefore it is necessary to believe truth which pertains to the supernatural order.

The result thus far is, that, in order to be Christians, to be saved, to enter into life, to secure the rewards of heaven, it is necessary to believe the truth which Jesus Christ taught, and that we cannot believe this without believing in that which is supernatural, and supernatural both as to the mode of communication and as to the matter communicated. The truth which Jesus Christ taught is, in general terms, the Gospel, or Christian revelation ; and the Christian revelation is a supernatural revelation, and, in part at least, a revelation of the supernatural. This revelation and its contents we must believe, or resign our pretensions to the Christian name. To believe this revelation and its contents is not, we admit, all that is requisite to the Christian character ; for there remain, beside faith, hope and charity, and the greatest is charity. Moreover, faith alone is insufficient to justify us in the sight of God ; for faith without works is dead, and therefore inoperative. Nevertheless, faith is indispensable. " For without faith it is impossible to please

God," and "He that believeth not shall be condemned." This much we conceive we have established; and this much, we presume, the *Christian Examiner* will concede.

II. 1. Faith or belief, as distinguished from knowledge and science, rests on authority extrinsic both to the believer and the matter believed. In it there is always assent to something propounded. If the motives of the assent are in the subject, it is called *knowledge*; if in the object, the assent is termed *science*; when in neither, it is termed *belief*, or *faith*. That the sun is now shining I know by my own senses; it is therefore a fact of knowledge; that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles, which I know not intuitively, but discursively, is a fact of science. Knowledge, in the sense we here use the term, is intuitive, and science discursive. In the first, I have no occasion to go out of myself to find my motives of assent; in the second, none to go out of the object. The first I know intuitively; the second I can demonstrate from what it contains in itself. But in belief I must go out of myself, and also out of the object, for my motives of assent. The matter assented to is neither intuitively certain, nor intrinsically evident. I am told there is such a city as Rome, which I have never seen. Having myself never seen Rome, I have no intuitive evidence that there is such a city. The proposition that there is such a city is not intrinsically evident, — contains nothing in itself from which I can demonstrate its truth. Its truth, then, can be established to me only by evidence extrinsic both to myself and the proposition, that is, by TESTIMONY. That there is a God is not a fact of knowledge, strictly speaking; for we do not know that there is a God, intuitively; but it is a fact of science, because we know it discursively, from the creation of the world, from the effect, or things that are made, as says St. Paul, Rom. i. 20. But that God has destined them that love him to the beatific vision is a fact neither of knowledge nor of science; for it is neither intuitively certain, nor internally demonstrable. It may be true; but whether so or not can be determined only by testimony, that is, evidence extrinsic both to the proposition and to myself. Hence St. Paul says, Heb. xi. 1, *Fides est sperandarum substantia rerum, argumentum non apparentium*; and St. Augustine, *Fides est credere quod non vides*. — Tract. 40 in Joan.

2. There may be matters contained in the Christian revelation which are matters of knowledge or of science, but we are

concerned with it now only so far as it is a matter of faith. As a matter of faith, its truth rests solely on extrinsic evidence, or testimony. We cannot, then, as reasonable beings, believe it, unless we have some extrinsic authority competent to vouch for its truth, or some witness whose testimony is credible. But as an object of faith, the Christian revelation, in part at least, is a revelation of the supernatural. Now, this which is supernatural cannot be adequately witnessed to or vouched for by any natural witness or authority. No witness is competent to testify to that which he does not or cannot himself know, either intuitively or discursively. But no natural being, how high so ever in the scale of being he may be exalted, can know either intuitively or discursively the truth of that which, as to its matter, is supernatural. The only adequate authority for the supernatural is the supernatural itself, that is, God. For though angels or divinely inspired men may declare the supernatural to us, yet they themselves are not witnesses to its intrinsic truth, and have no ground for believing its truth but the veracity of God revealing it to them. They may be competent witnesses to the fact of the revelation, but not to the truth of the matter revealed. The authority or ground for believing the supernatural matter revealed is, then, the veracity of God, and we cannot reasonably or prudently believe any proposition involving the supernatural on other authority. We have no sufficient ground for faith in such matters, unless we have the clear, express testimony of God himself. But the testimony of God is sufficient for any proposition, *in case we have it*; because enough is *clearly seen* of God from the creation of the world, and understood by the things that are made, to establish on a scientific basis the fact that he can neither deceive nor be deceived; for we can demonstrate scientifically, from principles furnished by the light of natural reason, that God is infinitely wise and good, and no being infinitely wise and good can deceive or be deceived. God is the first truth — *prima veritas* — in being, in knowing, and speaking, — *in essendo, in cognoscendo, et in dicendo*, — and therefore whatever he declares to be true must necessarily and infallibly be true. Nothing, then, is more reasonable than to believe God on his word or simple veracity; for it is no more than to believe that infinite and perfect truth, truth itself, cannot lie. Whatever God has revealed must be true. Even the *Examiner* would admit the doctrine of the Trinity, if it were proved to be a doctrine of Divine revelation. The witness, ground, or authority for believing the supernatural is the veracity of God,

and this all will admit to be sufficient, if we have it ; and none will admit, if they understand themselves, that a lower authority is sufficient.

3. But, although the veracity of God is the ground or authority on which we assent to the matter revealed, yet we cannot believe without sufficient evidence of the fact of revelation, or, in other words, without a witness competent to testify to the fact that God has actually revealed the matter in question, — made the particular revelation to which assent is demanded. The *Examiner* is Unitarian, but it will tell us that it ought to believe the doctrine of the Trinity, if God has revealed it. Yet it demands, very properly, evidence of the fact that God has revealed it or declared its truth. Reasonable or a well grounded belief in the supernatural, then, requires two witnesses, two vouchers ; one to the truth of the matter revealed, which is the veracity of God revealing it ; the other to the fact of the revelation, or that the matter in question has actually been revealed.

4. The revelation is made to intelligent beings, and must therefore consist in intelligible, enunciable propositions. We do not mean that the truths revealed should be comprehensible ; for every supernatural truth, as to its matter, must be wholly incomprehensible to natural reason ; but that the formal proposition of the truths to be believed must be intelligible. What is present to the mind, in believing the revelation, are these formal propositions, which convey the truth, but in an obscure manner, to the understanding. If we should mistake the propositions actually contained in God's revelation, or substitute others therefor, since it is only through the formal proposition we arrive at the matter revealed, we should not believe the revelation which God has actually made, but something else, and something else for which we cannot plead the veracity of God, and therefore something for which we have no solid ground of faith. Suppose you adduce a book which you say contains the revelation God has made, and suppose you bring ample vouchers for the fact that it really does contain such revelation. In this case I should have sufficient ground for believing the book to contain the word of God ; but before I should believe the word of God, that is the revelation itself, I must believe the contents of the book in their *genuine sense*. I must have, then, some authority, extrinsic or intrinsic, competent to declare what is the genuine sense of the book. What I believe is what is *in mente* when I believe. What is *in mente* is the interpreta-

tion or meaning I give to God's word. If this interpretation or meaning be not the *genuine sense*, I do not, as we have said, believe God's word, but something else. Faith in the supernatural requires, then, in addition to the witness that vouches for the fact that God has made the revelation, an interpreter competent to declare the true meaning of the revelation.

5. The faith we are required to have is equally required in all times and places. It is said, *qui non crediderit*,—that is, any one, without any limitation of time or space, who believeth not, shall be condemned. Then there must be no limitation of the conditions *sine qua non* of faith, in time or space. Then the witness for the faith, and the interpreter of God's word, must be present in all nations, and subsist through all ages. We who live in this country at the present day need them just as much and in the same sense as the Jews needed them in the age of the Apostles.

6. The witness to the fact of the revelation, and the interpreter of the word, must not only subsist through all ages and nations, but must be *unmistakable*; and unmistakable not only by a few philosophers, scholars, and men of parts and leisure, but by the great mass of the poor, the busy, the weak, the ignorant, the illiterate; for all these are equally commanded to believe, and have a right to have a solid ground of belief, which they cannot have, if they may mistake, with ordinary prudence, the true witness and interpreter, and call in a false witness and a misinterpreter.

7. The witness and interpreter must be infallible; for, if fallible, it may call that God's word which is not his word, and assign a meaning to God's word itself which is not the genuine meaning. We may, then, be deceived, and think we are believing God's word when we are not. But where there is a possibility of deception, there is room for doubt, and where there is room for doubt, there is no faith; for the property of faith is to exclude doubt. The Apostle says, "I know in whom I believe, and am certain," and whoever cannot say as much has not yet elicited an act of faith. Faith is a theological virtue, as we have proved in proving its necessity as one of the conditions of salvation; and it consists in believing, without doubting, explicitly or implicitly, all the truths God has revealed, on the veracity of God alone. It requires absolute certainty, both objective and subjective. Where there is belief without sufficient objective grounds of belief, the belief is not faith, but a mere opinion or persuasion. Mere subjective cer-

tainty, that is, an inward persuasion, even though it should exclude all actual doubt, would not be faith, unless warranted by evidence in which reason can detect no deficiency. It is a blind prejudice, and would vanish before the light of intelligence. A man may fancy that his head is set on wrong side before, and be so firmly persuaded of it that no reasoning can convince him to the contrary ; but his internal persuasion has little relation to faith. For faith is eminently, though not exclusively, an act of the understanding, and must be reasonable, and he who has it must have a solid reason which he may assign for it. The man does not believe, if he doubts, or may reasonably doubt; and if the evidence on which he fancies he believes is not sufficient, he may reasonably doubt. He who has for his faith only the testimony of a fallible witness, who may both deceive and be deceived, has always a reasonable ground for doubt, and therefore no solid ground for faith. If he reason at all on the testimony, open his eyes at all to his liability to be deceived, he cannot, however earnestly he may try to believe, avoid doubting. Therefore, since, with a fallible witness, or fallible interpreter, we can never be sure that we are not mistaken, it follows, if we are to have faith at all, we must have a witness and interpreter that cannot err, therefore infallible.

We sum up again by saying, that it is necessary to believe the truth Jesus Christ revealed, or, in other words, the Christian revelation ; that to believe this is to believe truths which pertain to the supernatural order ; and that, to have a solid ground for believing truths pertaining to the supernatural order, we must have, 1. The word or veracity of God ; 2. A witness to the fact of the revelation, and an interpreter of the genuine sense of what God has revealed, infallible and subsisting through all ages and nations, and, with ordinary prudence, unmistakable by even the least gifted and the least instructed. The first the *Examiner* will not deny us. We proceed to prove that we have the second.

III. There must be such a witness and interpreter, or, in other words, some infallible means of determining what is the word of God, because God has made belief of his word the condition *sine qua non* of salvation. We know from natural theology, that is, from what we can clearly see of God by natural reason, that he is, that he is just, and that he would not be just, should he make faith the condition *sine qua non* of salvation, and not

provide the conditions *sine qua non* of faith. He has made faith the condition *sine qua non* of salvation, as we have proved, and as the *Examiner* must admit, unless it chooses to deny the Christian revelation altogether. But the infallible witness and interpreter alleged is the condition *sine qua non* of faith, as we have shown from the nature of faith itself. Therefore, God, since he is just and cannot belie himself, *has* provided us with the witness and interpreter required, or, what is the same thing, some infallible means of determining what is the word he commands us to believe.

There is, then, the witness and interpreter of God's word in question. Who or what is it? To this question four answers may be returned: — 1. Reason; 2. The Bible; 3. Private illumination; 4. The Apostolic ministry, or *Ecclesia docens*, the Church teaching. Other answers may be conceived, but the true answer is manifestly one of these four.

1. Reason may be taken in two senses: — 1. The cognitive faculty, *vis intellectiva*, as distinguished from the sensibility, or *vis sensitiva*; 2. The discursive faculty, or *vis ratiocinativa*. In the first sense it is the faculty of knowing intuitively, and is the principle of what we term *knowledge*, in distinction from what is technically termed *science*. In this sense, reason, in order to answer our purpose, to serve as the witness and interpreter proved to be necessary, must be able either to know God intuitively, or to apprehend intuitively the intrinsic truth of his word. Reason must see God face to face, know intuitively that it is God who speaks; or it cannot testify, on its *own* knowledge, to the fact that the speaker alleged is God. But reason cannot see God thus face to face. We have and can have no intuitive knowledge of God, for him no man seeth or can see and live. Therefore reason cannot be the witness on the ground of its intuitive apprehension of God, nor can it be on the ground of its intuitive perception or apprehension of the intrinsic truth of the matter revealed. Our natural reason or power of knowing cannot extend beyond the bounds of nature. But the matter revealed, or truths to be believed, are supernatural, and therefore transcend the reach of natural intellect. If the natural intellect could attain to them, they would be, not supernatural, but natural. Moreover, if the intrinsic truth of the revelation could be apprehended, intuitively known, it would be, not a matter of faith, but of knowledge; for faith is, to believe what is not seen, — *argumentum non apparentium*. Heb. xi. 1. But it is a matter of faith, as already proved, and therefore

not of knowledge. Therefore reason cannot apprehend the intrinsic truth of the revelation, and from the intrinsic truth know it to have been divinely revealed. Therefore reason, as the *vis intellectiva*, cannot be the witness.

Reason, in the second sense, is discursive, the subjective principle of science in distinction from intuitive knowledge, — the faculty of deducing conclusions from given premises. If the premises are true, the conclusions are valid. But reason cannot furnish its own premises. They must be *given* it; hence, are called *data*. These *data* must be furnished either by knowledge, that is intuition, or by faith. But in the case before us they can be furnished by neither; — not by knowledge, as we have just proved; and not by faith, because faith is the matter in question.

Proof by reason, in the sense we now use the term, is called demonstration. The position assumed, when it is alleged that the discursive reason is the witness of the fact of revelation, is, that reason can find in the internal character of the revelation itself, or what purports to be a revelation, the *data* from which it can demonstrate that it is actually the word of God. But this is possible only on condition that reason, independently of all revelation, be in possession of so perfect a knowledge of God as to be able to say *a priori* what a revelation from God will be and must necessarily be. But this is inadmissible; 1. Because it would imply that the revelation is intrinsically evident to natural reason, and therefore that it is an object of science and not of faith; and 2. Because the revelation is of God as supernatural, and reason has no intimation, even, of God as the supernatural, save through the medium of supernatural revelation itself. The knowledge which reason has of God prior to the revelation is simply what is contained in natural theology, which is knowledge of God only as author, sustainer, and sovereign of nature. From this it is, indeed, possible to obtain *data* from which we may conclude, within certain limits, what a supernatural revelation cannot be, but not what it must be. God, whether as author of nature, or as author and dispenser of grace, that is, as natural or as supernatural, is one and the same being, and therefore cannot in the one be in contradiction to what he is in the other. If, in what purports to be a revelation from him, we find that which contradicts what is clearly seen of him from the creation of the world and the things that are made, we have the right to pronounce it, *a priori*, not his revelation. But beyond this reason cannot go; for it is not

lawful to conclude from nature to grace, from the natural to the supernatural, from *data* furnished by natural science to supernatural revelation. Reason, then, has no *data* from which it can conclude to the fact of the revelation. Therefore it cannot be the witness demanded.

Moreover, if reason knew enough of God, independently of the supernatural revelation, to be able, from the intrinsic character of the revelation, to pronounce on its genuineness, not only negatively but affirmatively, it would know all of God the revelation itself could teach. The revelation would then be superfluous, — in fact, no revelation at all ; and the question of its genuineness would be an idle question, not worth considering. To assume the competency of reason, as the witness, would then be to deny the necessity of the revelation and its value, which, in point of fact, is what all our Rationalists do, and apparently wish to do.

But, in denying the competency of reason as the witness to the fact of the revelation, we do not deny the office of reason in determining whether a revelation has been made, nor that the fact of revelation is, can, and should be, made evident to natural reason. We merely deny that it is *intrinsically* evident. It is not *intrinsically* evident, but *extrinsically* evident ; not internally demonstrable, but externally provable. It can be proved not *by* reason, but *to* reason by testimony ; and of the credibility of the testimony, reason may, can, and should judge.

Three things must always be kept distinct on the question of supernatural revelation : — 1. The ground of faith in the truths revealed ; 2. The authority on which we take the fact of revelation ; 3. The credibility of this authority. The first, as we have seen, is the veracity of God, and is sufficient, because God is *prima veritas in essendo, in cognoscendo, et in dicendo*, — the ultimate truth in being, in knowing, and in speaking, and therefore can neither deceive nor be deceived. The second we are seeking, and it is not a witness to the truth of the matter revealed, but to the fact that God reveals it, and can be competent only on condition of being itself supernatural or supernaturally enlightened. The third is the credibility of the witness to the fact of revelation, and must be evidenced to natural reason ; or there will be an impassable gulf between reason and faith, and we can have no reason for our faith, and therefore no faith.

The fact of revelation, we shall show in its proper place,

may be evidenced to natural reason through the credibility of the witness, and therefore, that faith is possible. But because reason is competent to judge of the credibility of the witness, we must not conclude that it is itself a competent witness to the fact of revelation. This conceded, the second answer is inadmissible, for the fact of revelation is neither intuitively certain nor internally demonstrable.

2. The answer just dismissed is that of the Rationalists, and is, in one of its forms, substantially the one which we ourselves gave in all we preached and wrote on the subject while associated with the Unitarians. This second answer is the Protestant answer, and the one, if we understand him, adopted by the writer in the *Christian Examiner*. This assumes that the Bible is the witness ; that is, the Bible interpreted by the private reason of the believer, availing himself of such aids, philological, critical, historical, &c., as may be within his reach. But this answer cannot be accepted, because, without an infallible authority independent of the Bible, it is impossible, 1. To settle the canon ; 2. To establish the sufficiency of the Scriptures ; 3. To determine their genuine sense.

The Bible can be adduced as the witness only in the character of an authentic record of the revelation actually made ; because, according to its own confession, as we may find on examining it, it was not the original medium of the revelation itself. The revelation, according to the Bible itself, in great part at least, was in the first instance made orally, and orally published before it was committed to writing. This is especially true of the Christian revelation, in so far as distinguished from the Jewish. It was communicated orally to the Apostles by Jesus Christ, and by them orally to the public ; and converts were made, and congregations of believers gathered, before one word of it was written. The writing was subsequent to the teaching and believing, and evidently, therefore, the primitive believers believed without having any authority for believing, or had an authority for believing independent of written documents. To them what we term the Bible was not the witness. It, then, was not the original witness, or, as we have said, the original medium of the revelation. Its value, then, must consist entirely in the fact, that it faithfully records, in an authentic form, what was actually revealed. It is, then, only as a record that it can be adduced as evidence. But a record is no evidence till authenticated. It cannot authenticate itself ; for, till authenticated, its testimony is inadmissible. It must be authenticated by some competent

authority independent of itself. This authentication of the Bible as a record of the revelation made is what we call settling the canon.

Now, it is obvious, that, till the canon is settled, we have no authentic record, no Bible, to adduce. We may have a number of books bound up together, to which the printer has given the title of *The Bible*; but what we want is not the book called the Bible, but authentic records to which we may appeal as evidence; and if the book we call the Bible contains books which are not authentic records, or does not contain all that are, we cannot appeal to it as evidence; for we may, in the one case, take for revelation what is not revelation, and, in the other, leave out what is revelation. This is evident of itself. We must, then, settle the canon. But where is the authority to settle it?

The authority must be, 1. Independent of the Bible; 2. Infallible. But the advocates of the answer we are considering admit no infallible authority but that of the Bible itself. Therefore they have no authority by which to settle the canon, or to determine what is Bible or what is not Bible.

It will not do to say, the canon is all those books which have been received by the Church as canonical; because the advocates of this answer deny the authority of the Church, and stoutly contend that it may both deceive and be deceived. It will not do to appeal to tradition; for what vouches for the inferrancy of tradition? And what right have Protestants to appeal to tradition, whose authority they do not admit, and which they contend may err and does err on many and the most vital points? Nor will it do to adduce the Fathers; for they only establish what in their time was the tradition or belief of the Church, by no means the intrinsic truth of that tradition or belief. Where, then, is the authority for settling the canon?

There is no authority, on Protestant principles, as is evident from the fact that Protestants have no canon. They all exclude from the canon established by the Church several books which the Church holds to be canonical. As to the remaining books, they dispute whether all are canonical or not. Luther rejects the Catholic Epistle of St. James, which he denominates "an epistle of straw," and also doubts the canonicity of several others. Mr. Andrews Norton, a learned and leading Unitarian, formerly a professor in the *Divinity School*, Cambridge, rejects pretty much the whole of the Old Testament, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of James and Jude,

the second of Peter, and the Apocalypse, in the New Testament, casts suspicion on the canonicity of all the Pauline Epistles, strikes out the first chapters of Matthew and Luke, and such portions of the remaining books as are demanded by the conveniences of his critical canons, or the exigencies of his dogmatic theology. Not a few of our Unitarians restrict the canon to the four Gospels. Several of the Germans strike from these the Gospel according to St. John ; while Strauss, Feuerbach, and the Rev. Theodore Parker, the distinguished pastor of the Unitarian church in West Roxbury, Massachusetts, regard the remaining Gospel narratives rather as a collection of anecdotes illustrating the notions of the early Christian believers, than as authentic histories of events which actually transpired ; and the great body of Liberal Christians, who are the Protestants of Protestants, agree that the Bible is so loosely written, is so filled with metaphor and Oriental hyperbole, that no argument, especially no doctrine, can be safely built on single words, or even single sentences, however plain, positive, and uncontradicted, or unmodified by other portions of Scripture, their meaning may seem to be. It is evident, from this statement of facts, that Protestants have no canon ; that each private man is at liberty to settle the canon according to his own judgment or caprice ; and therefore that they have no authentic record to adduce as evidence of the fact of revelation. They must agree among themselves what is Bible, what is inspired Scripture, and authenticate the record, before they can legitimately introduce it as an infallible witness.

But pass over the difficulty of settling the canon ; suppose the canon to be settled according to the decision of the Church, and that, by an inconsistency which in the present case cannot be avoided, the authority of the Church to settle the canon is conceded ; still there remains the question of the *sufficiency* of the Scriptures. The record, however authentic it may be, can be evidence only for what is contained in it. If it does not contain the whole revelation, it is not evidence for the whole. If not evidence for the whole, it is not sufficient ; for it is the *whole* revelation, not merely a part, to which the witness is needed to testify.

That the Scriptures do contain the whole revelation is not to be presumed prior to proof ; because they themselves testify that they are not, at least only in part, the original medium of the revelation. If the revelation had been, in the first instance, made by writing, and by writing only, then, if we had the en-

tire *written* word, we should have the right to conclude that we had the whole *revealed* word. But since a part of the revelation, to say the least, was communicated orally, taught and believed before the writing was commenced, we cannot conclude from the possession of the entire written word to the possession of the entire revealed word, unless we have full evidence that the whole revealed word has been written. The fact of the sufficiency of the Scriptures is not, then, to be presumed from the fact of their canonicity. It is a fact to be proved, not taken for granted.

But this fact cannot be proved by tradition, by the authority of the Church, or by the testimony of the Fathers ; for these all, on Protestant principles, are fallible, and not to be depended upon ; and, moreover, they all testify against the fact in question. It cannot be proved by reason ; because reason takes cognizance not of the fact of revelation, but simply of the motives of credibility. It must be proved by an authority above reason, and, as already established, by an authority which cannot err. But the Bible is asserted to be the only inerrable authority. Therefore it must be proved from the Bible itself. But the Bible proves no such thing, for it nowhere professes to contain the whole revelation which has been made, but even indicates to the contrary. Therefore the sufficiency of the Scriptures cannot be proved. But the sufficiency of the Scriptures must mean that they are sufficient to teach not only the whole revelation of God, but the fact that they do teach the whole ; for without this no one can know whether he has the faith God commands him to have, or not. But in failing to prove their sufficiency, they fail to prove this fact ; therefore, by failing to prove their sufficiency, they prove their own insufficiency.

It may be replied, that, though the Scriptures may not contain a full record of all that was revealed, they nevertheless contain all that it is necessary to be believed in order to be saved. We considered this in our former number, in our review of the *Lectures* of Bishop Hopkins, on the *British Reformation*. We reply now, 1. That the command of God to us is not to believe the Bible, or the written word, but the revelation which he has made ; and therefore we are not to presume that we have the faith required, from the fact that we believe the whole written word, unless we have first established the fact that the written word is commensurate with the revealed word. 2. God, we know by natural reason, cannot reveal what he does not re-

quire to be believed ; for the truth revealed while unbelieved, so far as unbelieved, is as if unrevealed, and therefore its revelation has no sufficient reason. But God cannot act without a sufficient reason. No sufficient reason for the revelation of truth, but that it should be believed, can be conceived, or possibly exist. Therefore God reveals it that it should be believed. Then he requires it to be believed. No one can fail to do what God requires, without sin. If we cannot fail to believe what God has revealed, without sin, we cannot be saved without believing it. Therefore, it is necessary to salvation to believe all that God has revealed. Again :

God cannot make a revelation and require us to believe it, without making it so evident that we can have no intellectual reason for not believing it. Unbelief, then, must be the result of some perversity of the will, some moral repugnance, which withholds us from the consideration of the truth revealed, and the evidences of the fact of its revelation. But this perversity of will, this moral repugnance, is a sin, and as much so in the case of one truth revealed as in the case of another. Therefore we cannot refrain from believing what God has revealed, without sin. Therefore it is necessary to believe all that God has revealed, in order to be saved. Therefore the Scriptures do not contain all that it is necessary to believe for salvation, unless they contain all that God has revealed.

3. But waiving these considerations, it is either a fact that the Scriptures do contain all that is necessary to salvation, or it is not. If it be a fact, it is a fact which must be proved, and proved by a competent authority. The only competent authority, on Protestant principles, is the Bible itself. If the Bible asserts that it contains all that is necessary to be believed in order to be saved, then it must be conceded that it does. If it assert no such thing, then the proposition is false. But the Bible nowhere asserts that it contains all that is necessary to be believed in order to be saved. Therefore, the Bible does not contain all that is necessary to be believed ; for this fact itself, of the sufficiency of the faith it does contain, is itself essential to that sufficiency.

But even admitting the Scriptures may contain the whole revelation, it is not possible by private reason alone to be infallibly certain of their genuine sense. To believe that the Scriptures contain the whole word of God is not to believe that word itself. It is merely believing them to be authoritative, which is indeed something, and, in this age of infidelity, ration-

alism, and transcendentalism, no doubt a great deal ; but is not the faith required. The command is not to believe that the Bible is an authentic record of the revelation, but to believe the truths revealed, — not the Bible, but what the Bible, rightly interpreted, teaches. The truths revealed are the object, or, as the theologians say, *objectum materiale* of faith ; and these evidently are not believed, unless the Bible be believed in its genuine sense, even assuming the Bible to contain them all.

We insist on this point, because it is one on which there are frequent and dangerous mistakes. The matter of faith is these revealed truths, which are fixed and unalterable, universal and eternal, and which must be carefully distinguished from our notions or apprehensions of them, which are dependent on our mental states or conditions, and change and fluctuate as we ourselves change or fluctuate. These notions are not the matter of faith, and to hold fast these is quite another thing from holding fast the truths themselves. If these notions, which are our interpretations or constructions of the truth, were the faith required, the faith would be one thing with one man, another thing with another, and one thing with the same man yesterday, another to-day, and perhaps still another to-morrow. The true faith is an undoubting belief of the TRUTH, not what a man honestly *thinks* to be the truth, but what really is truth ; or otherwise men could be saved under any form of faith, and under one form of faith as well as another, so far as faith is requisite to salvation, for there is probably no form of error which has not its honest adherents. Sincerity in the belief of error cannot be the substitute for Christian faith ; for we have found that the faith which is the condition *sine qua non* of salvation is belief of truth and not falsehood, and of that very truth which Jesus Christ revealed. But this truth we do not believe, unless it lie in our interpretation as it lay in the mind of Jesus Christ himself. If it do not so lie, then we misinterpret it, and the misinterpretation of truth is not truth, and to believe this misinterpretation is to believe not the truth, but something else. If, then, we do not believe the revelation made in the Scriptures, in its genuine sense, in the sense intended by Almighty God, we do not believe the revelation at all.

Now, it is necessary not only that we seize, without any mistake, this genuine sense, but that we be infallibly certain that we have seized it, and not another sense. Even admitting that with nothing but private reason we could hit upon the genuine sense of Scripture, it would avail us nothing, unless we had

this infallible certainty ; because without this infallible certainty we could not have faith. Will any man pretend that it is possible by private reason alone to be infallibly certain that we have the genuine sense of the Scriptures ? We may, perhaps, *feel* certain ; but this *feeling* certain is not faith. Faith is a firm, unwavering, and unwaverable conviction of the understanding, as well as a cheerful assent of the will, resulting from the presence of full and infallible evidence. The mere feeling is worth nothing. Every enthusiast, every fanatic, has the feeling ; but he who has nothing else is a mere reed shaken with the wind, or a wild beast let loose in society, as unacceptable to God as unprofitable to himself or dangerous to his associates. It is not this Almighty God demands of us, and it is not for the want of this that he places us under condemnation and suffers his wrath to abide upon us. No ; we must have certainty, an intellectual certainty, certainty which the mind can grasp, and its hold of which all the craftiness of subtle sophists, all the allurements of the world, all the temptations of the flesh, and all the assaults of hell, cannot induce it for one moment to relax. We must have a faith which can be proof against all trials, come they from what quarter they may ; for our life is a warfare, an incessant warfare, and there come to all of us moments when nothing but a firm, fixed, and unalterable faith can sustain us,—moments when feeling, when the dearest affections of the heart, when all that can powerfully affect us as creatures of time and sense, conspire against us, and we must stand up against them and even against ourselves. O, in these terrible moments, in the sacred name of Christian charity, mock us not with a faith that melts away into mere feeling, and vanishes in mere caprice !

Now, it needs no words to prove that a faith which is not grounded on the word of God, who can neither deceive nor be deceived, will not answer our wants, will not be proof against the many “ fiery trials ” to which it must needs in this world be subjected. But we have no such faith merely because we have the Bible in our possession, nor because the Bible contains the word of God, nor because we read and study it and believe that we believe it. We have such a faith only on condition of knowing infallibly that what we take to be the meaning of the Bible is God’s meaning ; for the faith is belief of the truth as it is in Jesus, not as it may be in us. We ask again, Can private reason give us this certainty ?

This is a serious question, and one which the Protestant must

answer, before he can have any solid reason for his faith. It will not do to call upon us to prove the negative ; for, even if we could not prove that it is impossible from the Bible and private reason to become infallibly certain of the genuine sense of the word of God, it would not follow that we can from them obtain the infallible certainty without which there is no faith, and, if no faith, no salvation. He who affirms the proposition must prove it, not for the sake of meeting the logical conditions of his opponent's argument, for that is an affair of small moment ; but for himself, for his own mind, to have in himself and for himself a well grounded faith. Now, how will he prove this proposition, that from the Bible and private reason alone he can ascertain the genuine sense of the word of God, and know infallibly that he has that sense ?

Will he prove this proposition from the Bible ? He is bound by his own principles to do this ; for this is his rule of faith, and his rule of faith should rest on Divine authority. But he admits no Divine authority but the Bible. Then he must prove it from the Bible, or admit that he has no sufficient authority for it. Can he prove it from the Bible ? Not in express terms, for the Bible in express terms does not assert it, as is well known. It can be proved from the Bible only by means of certain passages which are assumed to imply it. But whether these do imply it or not depends on the interpretation we give them. It can be proved from Scripture, then, only by a resort to interpretation. But the interpretation demands the application, the use of the rule, as the condition of establishing it. But how determine that the interpretation which authorizes the rule is not itself a misinterpretation, especially since it is an interpretation which is disputed ? Can the rule be proved from reason ? Not from reason, as the faculty of intuition ; because the fact, that from the Bible and private reason alone we can infallibly determine what it is that God has actually revealed, is evidently not intuitively certain. From reason, as the *vis ratiocinativa* ? From what *data* shall we conclude to it ? It may be said, that God is just, that he has made a revelation, commanded us to believe it, and made our belief of it the condition *sine qua non* of salvation ; but that he would not be just in so doing, if this revelation were not infallibly ascertainable in its genuine sense by the prudent exercise of natural reason. Ascertainable by natural reason *in one method or another*, we grant ; but by private reason and the Bible alone, we deny the consequence : for God may have made the revelation ascertainable only by a di-

vinely commissioned and supernaturally guided and protected body of teachers, and the office of natural reason to be to judge of the credibility of this body of teachers. From the fact that the revelation is addressed to reasonable beings, and is to be believed by such, and therefore must be made intelligible, it does not necessarily follow that it must be intelligible from the Scriptures and private reason alone. For this would imply that the Scriptures were intended to be the medium and the only medium through which God makes his revelation to men ; the very question in dispute.

Can it be proved as a matter of fact, from experience ? We have before us the history of Protestant sects for the last three hundred years. A three hundred years' experience ought to suffice to demonstrate the possibility of their ascertaining the sense of God's word, if it be thus ascertainable. Yet Protestants during this long period have done little else than vary their interpretations, dispute, wrangle, divide, subdivide, and sub-subdivide, on the question of what it is God has revealed. They are now split up into some five or six hundred sects. There is not a single doctrine in which they all agree ; not a single doctrine has been asserted by one that has not been denied by another. The writer in the *Examiner* is a conscientious and devout Unitarian, and yet how large a portion of his Protestant brethren will not deem it an excess of courtesy on our part to treat him and his associates as Christian believers ? The Gospel according to the late Dr. Channing has very little affinity with the Gospel according to Dr. Beecher. Now, truth is one, and can admit of but one true interpretation. Of these many hundred Protestant interpretations, only one at most can be the true interpretation ; all the rest are false interpretations, and their adherents are no Christian believers. Can any Protestant say with infallible certainty that his interpretation is the true one ? If not, how can he elicit an act of faith ? If he cannot elicit an act of faith, how can he be a Christian ?

The writer in the *Examiner* makes very light of these different interpretations of the word of God, and thinks difference of interpretation can do no great harm, because, in his judgment, over it all "there may prevail a harmony of sentiment and a harmony of life." But he mistakes the end of unity of faith. Unity of faith is essential because truth is one, and there can be but one true faith, and without this true faith salvation is not possible, as before proved. *Sine fide impossibile est placere Deo* ; and this must needs be the true faith, not a false faith, which

in fact is no faith at all. Our Unitarian friend seems to imagine that what we are required to believe is, not the truth, but what we *think* to be the truth ; that is, we are required to believe the truth not as it is in Jesus, but merely as it is in ourselves ! Does he find any proof of this convenient doctrine in the Scriptures ? Can he adduce a " Thus saith the Lord " for it ? If not, according to his own principles, it rests only on human authority, on which he does not allow us to believe ; for he makes it the duty of the believer to stand up firm against all human dictation in matters of belief. In this he is right, and we must have higher authority than even his, before we can consent to regard any man's constructions of the truth, unless we have infallible authority for believing them the true constructions, as the truth Almighty God commands us to believe, and for not believing which we must lie under his wrath and condemnation.

No argument can be drawn, it is evident, from experience, to prove that from the Bible and private reason alone we can determine with infallible certainty what is the revelation of God. So far as experience throws any light on the subject, it warrants the opposite conclusion, and makes it pretty nearly certain that without something else faith is out of the question. Protestants, in fact, have no faith ; nay, so far from having any faith, nearly all of them deny its possibility, in the sense in which it is any thing more than a strong inward persuasion. They have, as we have seen, no authority from the Bible, from reason, or from experience, for their rule of faith ; and they cannot be such poor logicians as to infer that they can have faith by virtue of a rule which is not authorized. This is, no doubt, a serious matter for them ; for, ever must ring in their ears *sine fide impossibile est placere Deo,—qui non crediderit condemnabitur*. We must, then, either give up the possibility of faith, or seek some other than the Protestant answer to the question, Who or what is the witness to the fact of revelation ?

3. The insufficiency of this answer has been felt even by Protestants themselves, and some of them have proposed a *third* answer, which we may denominate Private Illumination, because it is a revelation made for the special benefit of him who receives it, and not a revelation to be communicated by him for the faith or confirmation of the faith of others. It is contended for under various forms, but the more common form, and the one which principally concerns us in this discussion, is the Calvinistic, or what is usually denominated *Christian Expe-*

rience. This concedes the defectiveness of the logical evidence of the fact of revelation, and pretends that it is supplied by a certain interior illumination from the Holy Ghost in the fact of regeneration, whereby the believer is enabled to know by his own experience the truth of the doctrines he believes or is required to believe. The famous Jonathan Edwards was a great advocate for this, and sets it forth with considerable ability in his *Treatise on the Affections*, and especially in a sermon on *The Reality of the Spiritual Light*, preached at Northampton in 1734. It is insisted on, we believe, by all our Protestant sects that claim to be *Evangelical*. Indeed, this, in their estimation, constitutes the chief mark by which Evangelicals are distinguished from Non-evangelicals.

That there is a Christian sense, so to speak, — internal tradition as it is called, to distinguish it from the external, — which belongs to Christians, and which makes them altogether better judges of what is Christian truth than are those who are out of the pale of Christendom, and that the regenerate, the elect, those who belong to the soul of the Church, have a clearer perception, a more vivid appreciation, of the truth, beauty, grandeur, and worth of Christian faith than have the unregenerate, we of course very distinctly and cheerfully admit. We also admit, and contend, that “faith is the gift of God,” not merely because it is belief in truth which God has graciously revealed, as our Unitarian friends apparently maintain, but because no man can believe, even now that the truth is revealed, without the aid of divine grace, that is to say, without grace supernaturally bestowed. Faith is a virtue which has merit ; but no virtue possible without the aid of divine grace has merit, — that is, merit in relation to the reward of eternal life. The grace of faith is absolutely essential to the eliciting of the act of faith. So far we recognize our Calvinistic brethren as orthodox.

But wherein lies the necessity of this grace, and for what is it needed ? *Not to supply the defect of evidence, but to incline the will.* Unbelief is a sin, and a sin of no small magnitude ; but this sin is not in the intellect, for sin is predicable only of the will. Yet, if the evidence of a given doctrine were insufficient to convince the intellect, there could be no sin in the will's refusing to believe it. No man is to blame for not believing what is not infallibly evidenced to his understanding. The sin is in refusing to believe what is so evidenced ; for such refusal can result only from some moral repugnance to the truth, or perversity of the will, which withholds the man from the con-

temptation of the truth and consideration of its evidence. God has made a revelation, and given infallible evidence that he has made it, and men refuse to believe it because they have a moral repugnance to it. Herein is the sin of unbelief. The grace of faith is needed not to strengthen the evidence, nor even to open the eyes of the mind to its completeness, but to overcome this repugnance, and to incline the will to believe. Here, in the region of the will, divine grace is indispensable to eliciting the act of faith.

But the view which makes the grace of faith necessary to supply the defect of logical evidence cannot be admitted. If the grace bestowed in the fact of regeneration be necessary to supply the defect of evidence, it follows, that, prior to regeneration, there is no sufficient evidence for believing. But where there is no sufficient evidence for believing, the refusal to believe is not a sin. Therefore, prior to regeneration, unbelief is *not* a sin. The obligation to believe does not begin till the evidence be complete. The unregenerate, then, are under no obligation to believe, and do not in any manner sin by not believing. This is evidently not the Christian doctrine, for God commands all men to repent and believe in his Son.

But the fact of regeneration, according to our Calvinistic brethren, consists preëminently in the communication of the grace of faith and they would at once deny the reality of the conversion, if there were not both habitual and active faith. There is, according to them, no amissibility of grace. From which it follows, that, after regeneration, unbelief is impossible. Before regeneration it is possible, but not a sin. Therefore unbelief is never a sin,—a most consoling conclusion to all infidels and misbelievers. Yet the New Testament makes want of faith in Jesus Christ, or, what is the same thing, the rejection of the Son, a ground of condemnation.

In another form, the doctrine of private illumination is made to mean not merely the confirmation of the believer's faith in a revelation previously made and propounded for his belief, but the medium of the revelation itself. It regards all external revelation, all that may be called historical Christianity, as unnecessary, and teaches that each man has, by grace, the infallible witness in himself, that the Spirit of Truth, promised by Christ to his Apostles to lead them into all truth, is in every man, and has been in every man born into the world, from Adam to the present moment, and is in each man an infallible teacher, revealing and confirming to each man all the truth

which concerns his spiritual state, relations, and destiny. We say, *by grace* ; for we do not here speak of the doctrine of our modern Transcendentalists, which, though often confounded with the view we have given, the Quaker view, is yet quite distinguishable from it. The Transcendental doctrine excludes all grace, all that is supernatural, and assumes, that man, by virtue of his natural union with the Divinity, is able to apprehend intuitively all the spiritual truths that concern him. This, with a Transcendental felicity of expression, has been denominated "Natural-supernaturalism." But this is only another way of stating the doctrine refuted under the head of the sufficiency of reason as the *vis intellectiva*, or principle of intuitive knowledge. "Natural-supernatural" is a barbarism, and involves a direct contradiction. Either the truths attained are attained by the natural exercise of our natural powers, or they are not. If not, the Transcendental doctrine is false, for then the knowledge of them would be supernatural. If they are, then they are not supernatural at all. Transcendentalism, in point of fact, admits no supernatural order. Its adherents, following the sublimated nonsense of that profound opium-eater and literary plagiarist, Coleridge, define supernatural to be *supersensuous* ; and because by science we evidently can attain to what is not sensuous, they sagely infer that we are able to know naturally the supernatural ! Just as if what is naturally attained could be supernatural, either as the object known, or as the medium by which it is known ! Just as if nature could not include the supersensuous as well as the sensuous, as if the soul were not as natural as the body, an angel as man ! But this "natural-supernaturalism" which makes the fortune of Carlyle, Emerson, Parker, and we know not of how many German dreamers, is nothing but a Transcendental way of denying all supernatural revelation, and its refutation does not belong to the present discussion. It is intended to account for the phenomena presented by the religious history of mankind, without the admission of the supernatural or gracious intervention of Almighty God, and will receive some attention when we come to defend Christianity against unbelievers. We have no concern with it now, for at present we are defending the Church against heretics, not infidels.

The Quaker view is theoretically, though perhaps not practically, distinct from this Transcendental natural-supernaturalism. It does not assume that the supernatural is naturally cognoscible, nor that the supernatural is merely the supersensuous.

It admits the supernatural order, and contends that the witness in every man is distinct from human nature and human reason, and is in the proper sense of the term supernatural. Now this witness, called "the light within," either enables us to see intuitively the truth, or it merely witnesses to the fact of revelation. If the first, it is too much; for it would imply that the truth is matter of knowledge and not of faith, contrary to what we have proved. Moreover, it would imply that man is blest with the beatific vision in this life, and sees and knows God intuitively, which is not true; for no man seeth God, or can see him and live. If the second, then, to the fact of *what* revelation does it witness? To the revelation which God has made us through his Son Jesus Christ? Does it witness to this by an inward perception of the truth of the matter revealed? or by simply deposing to the fact that God revealed it? Not the first, because that would make the truth revealed a matter of science. Then the second. But of this we demand proof. Do you say, that the spirit beareth witness to the fact? This may perhaps do for you, but what is it to me? How will you prove to me that it does so witness, and that the spirit witnessing in you is veritably and infallibly the spirit of God? Do you allege, the spirit is in every man testifying to the same fact, and proving itself to each man to be really and truly the infallible spirit of God? I deny it, and millions deny it with me. What have you to oppose to our denial? Do you admit our denial? Then you abandon your doctrine. Do you say our denial is false? Then, also, you abandon your doctrine; for you admit that we err, and therefore cannot have in us an infallible teacher. If I deny, I deny by as high authority as you affirm; and what reason, then, can you give why your affirmation must be received rather than my denial?

Again: How do you prove that every man has this infallible witness? From the external revelation, by passages from the Holy Scriptures? Then you reason in a vicious circle; for you take the inward witness to prove the Scriptures, and then the Scriptures to prove the witness. From immediate revelation to yourself? Then you must prove that you are the recipient of such revelation, which you can do only by a miracle, for a miracle is the only proper proof of such a fact.

But do you abandon the ground that it is the external revelation to which the witness deposes, and contend that it is rather the medium of a revelation made solely to the individual, than the witness to a revelation made and propounded for the belief

of all men in common? Then we must remind you that it is nothing to the purpose. Assuming its reality, it can avail only each man separately; nothing to a *common* belief, and be no ground for crediting a common revelation, or for making a public or external profession of faith. But the revelation to which we are seeking a witness is not a new revelation, not a private revelation which Almighty God may see proper to make to individuals, but a revelation already made, and propounded for the belief of all men. This is the revelation to be established; and since your private revelation does not establish this, or, if so, only by superseding it and rendering it of no value (for it can prove it even to the individual only by its being seen to be identical with what the individual receives without it), it evidently cannot be the witness we are in pursuit of. And this is the common answer to the alleged private illumination, whatever its form. It is valid only within the bosom of the individual, and can be alleged in support of no common or public faith; therefore can be no witness in any disputed case. It may be a private benefit, or may not be. It is a matter not to be spoken of, and a fact never to be used, when the question concerns any thing but the individual himself. The faith we are required to have is a faith propounded to all men, a public faith, and must be sustained by public evidence, by arguments which are open to all and common to all. We must, therefore, reject this *third* answer, as inappropriate and insufficient.

4. From what we have established it follows that the witness to the fact of revelation is not reason, the Bible interpreted by private reason, nor private illumination; although we by no means question the fact that through grace even the understanding is illuminated. No witness, then, remains to be introduced but the Apostolic ministry, or *Ecclesia docens*. We do not, as we have said, deny the possibility on the part of God of adopting some other method; but he manifestly has not adopted any other than one of the four methods we have enumerated. The first three of these four we have proved he cannot have adopted, because they are inadequate. Then, either the last method is adopted, and the Apostolic ministry is the witness, or we have no witness. But we have a witness, as before proved. Therefore, the Apostolic ministry, or *Ecclesia docens*, is the witness.

This conclusion stands firm without any further proof, but we do not intend to leave it without proving it *a posteriori*, by

plain, positive, and direct evidence. But before proceeding to do this, we must dispose of one or two preliminary difficulties. According to the principles we have laid down, the witness to the supernatural is incompetent unless it be itself supernatural, or, what is the same thing, supernaturally aided. But the Apostolic ministry is composed of men, each of whom, taken singly, is confessedly only human. The whole is only the sum of the parts. Therefore the ministry itself is only human. If human, natural. If natural, incompetent. Therefore the Apostolic ministry cannot be such a witness as is demanded.

This objection is founded on the supposition that the collective body of teachers are assumed to be the witness by virtue of their natural powers or endowments, which is not the fact. Left to their natural powers, the body of teachers, taken either singly or corporately, would be altogether incompetent, however learned, wise, or pious. The competency of the body of teachers is contended for solely on the ground that Jesus Christ is with it, and supernaturally speaks in and through it; and in and through the body rather than the teachers taken singly, because his promise, on which we rely, is made to the body, and not to the individuals taken singly. The ministry is the organ through which Jesus Christ *supernaturally* bears witness to his own revelation. If this be a fact, if Jesus Christ really, by his supernatural presence, be with the Ministry, if in its authoritative teachings he makes it his organ and speaks in and through it, its competency cannot be questioned; for we then have in it the supernatural witness to the supernatural. Whether this be a fact or not will be soon considered.

But it is still further objected, that, if the witness to the supernatural must be itself supernatural, the supernatural can never be witnessed to natural reason, and therefore man can never have any good grounds for believing the supernatural, unless he be himself supernaturally elevated above his nature. For the competency of the supernatural witness is a supernatural fact which can be proved only by another supernatural witness, which in turn will require still another, and thus on, *in infinitum*, which is impossible. But we must distinguish between the competency of the witness to testify to the fact of revelation and the motives of the credibility of the witness. The competency of the witness depends on its supernatural character; the motives of credibility are such as natural reason may appreciate. The credibility of the witness is supernaturally

established to natural reason by means of miracles. A miracle is a supernatural effect produced in or on natural objects, and therefore connects the natural and supernatural, so that natural reason can pass from the one to the other. Since the miracle is wrought on natural objects, it is cognizable by natural reason, and natural reason is able to determine whether a given fact be or be not a miracle. From the miracle the reason concludes legitimately to the supernatural cause, and to the Divine commission or authority of him by whom it is wrought. Having established the Divine commission or authority of the miracle-worker, we have established his credibility, by having established the fact that God himself vouches for the truth of his testimony. The miracle, therefore, supersedes the necessity of the supposed infinite series of supernatural witnesses, by connecting the natural immediately with the supernatural. It is God's own assurance to natural reason, that he speaks in and by or through the person by whom it is performed. Then we have the veracity of God for the truth of what the miracle-worker declares, and therefore infallible certainty ; for God can neither deceive nor be deceived.

The supernatural, it follows from what we have said, is provable. Consequently the character of the Apostolic ministry, as the supernatural witness to the fact of revelation, is provable, that is, is not intrinsically unprovable. It becomes a simple question of fact, and is to be proved or disproved in like manner as any other question of fact falling under the cognizance of natural reason. The process of proof is simple and easy. The miracles of our blessed Saviour were all that was necessary to establish his Divine authority to those who saw them ; for it was evident, as Nicodemus said to him, " No man can do these miracles which thou doest, unless God be with him." St. John iii. 2. These accredited him as a teacher from God. Then he was necessarily what he professed to be, and what he declared to be God's word was God's word. This, the *Examiner* will admit, was sufficient for the eyewitness of the miracles.

But we are not eyewitnesses. True ; but the fact, whether the miracles were performed or not, is a simple historical question, to which reason is as competent as to any other historical question. If it can be established infallibly to us that the miracles were actually performed, we are virtually and to all intents and purposes in the condition of the eyewitnesses themselves, and they are to us all they were to them. Then they accredit to us, as to them, the Divine commission of Jesus, and au-

thorize the conclusion that whatever he said or promised was infallible truth ; for whether you say Jesus was himself truly God as well as truly man, or that he was only divinely commissioned, you have in either case the veracity of God as the ground of faith in what he said or promised.

Now, suppose it be a fact that Jesus appointed a body of teachers, and promised to be always with them, protecting them from error and teaching them all truth ; and suppose, farther, that the appointment and promise are ascertainable by natural reason, infallibly ascertainable. We should have infallible certainty that Jesus Christ does speak in and through this body, that it is infallible in what it teaches, and therefore that what it declares to be the word of God is the word of God ; for it is infallibly certain that Jesus Christ will keep his promise, since the promise is made by God himself, either directly, as we hold, or through his accredited agent, as the *Examiner* holds, and it is impossible for God to lie, or to promise and not fulfil. In this case, calling this body of teachers the Catholic Church, we could make our act of faith without the least room for doubt or hesitation. " O my God ! I firmly believe all the sacred truths the Catholic Church believes and teaches, because *thou* hast revealed them, who canst neither deceive nor be deceived."

Assuming the facts in the case to be as here supposed, the only points in this process to which exceptions can possibly be taken, or which can by any one be alleged to be not infallibly certain, are, 1. The competency of natural reason from historical testimony to establish the fact that the miracles were actually performed ; 2. Admitting the facts to be infallibly ascertainable, the competency of reason to determine infallibly whether they are miracles or not ; 3. The competency of reason from the miracle to conclude to the Divine authority of the miracle-worker ; 4. Its competency from historical documents to ascertain infallibly the fact of the appointment of the body of teachers, and the promise made them. These four points, unquestionably essential to the validity of the argument, are to be taken, we admit, on the authority of reason. Can reason determine these with infallible certainty ? But, if you say it can, you affirm the infallibility of reason, and then it of itself suffices, without other infallible teacher ; if you say it cannot, you deny the possibility of establishing infallibly the infallibility of your body of teachers.

We reply by distinguishing. Reason is infallible within its

own province, we grant ; but in regard to what transcends its reach we deny. To deny the infallibility of reason within its province would be to deny the possibility not only of faith, but of both science and knowledge, and to sink into absolute skepticism,—even to “doubt that doubt itself be doubting,”—which is impossible ; for no man doubts that he doubts. Revelation does not deny reason, but presupposes it, and supplies its defect by faith. The objection to reason is not that it cannot judge infallibly of *some* matters, but that it cannot judge infallibly of *all* matters. But, because it cannot judge infallibly of all matters, to say it can judge infallibly of none is not to reason justly. As well say, I am not infallibly certain that I see the tree before my window, because I cannot see all that may be going on in the moon. It is infallibly certain that the same thing cannot both be and not be at the same time ; that two things respectively equal to a third are equal to one another ; that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles ; that what begins to exist must have a creator ; that every effect must have a cause, and that every supernatural effect must have a supernatural cause, and that the change of one natural substance into another natural substance is a supernatural effect ; that every voluntary agent acts to some end, and every wise and good agent to a wise and good end. These and the like propositions are all infallibly certain. Reason, within its sphere, is therefore infallible ; but out of its sphere it is null.

Human testimony, within its proper limits, backed by circumstances, monuments, institutions which presuppose its truth and are incompatible with its falsehood, is itself infallible. I have never seen London, but I have no occasion to see it in order to be as certain of its existence as I am of my own. History, too, is a science ; and although every thing narrated in it may not be true or even probable, yet there are historical facts as certain as mathematical certainty itself. It is infallibly certain that there were in the ancient world the republics of Athens, Sparta, and Rome ; that there was a peculiar people called the Jews, that this people dwelt in Palestine, that they had a chief city named Jerusalem, in this chief city a superb temple dedicated to the worship of the one God, and that this chief city was taken by the Romans, this temple burnt, and this people, after an immense slaughter, were subdued, and dispersed among the nations, where they remain to this day. Here are historical facts, which can be infallibly proved to be facts.

Now, the miracles, regarded as facts, are simple historical

facts, said to have occurred at a particular time and place, and are in their nature as susceptible of historical proof as any other facts whatever. Ordinary historical testimony is as valid in their case as in the case of Cæsar's or Napoleon's battles. Reason, observing the ordinary laws of historical criticism, is competent to decide infallibly on the fact whether they are proved to have actually occurred or not. Reason, then, is competent to the *first* point in the process of proof, namely, the fact of the miracles.

It is equally competent to the *second* point, namely, whether the fact alleged to be a miracle really be a miracle. A miracle is a supernatural effect produced in or on natural objects. The point for reason to make out, after the fact is proved, is whether the effect actually witnessed be a *supernatural* effect. That it can do this in every case, even when the effect is truly miraculous, we do not pretend ; but that it can do it in some cases, we affirm, and to be able to do it in one suffices. When I see one natural substance changed into another natural substance, as in the case of converting water into wine, I know the change is a miracle ; for nature can no more change herself than she could create herself. So, when I see a man who has been four days dead, and in whose body the process of decomposition has commenced and made considerable progress, restored to life and health, sitting with his friends at table and eating, I know it is a miracle ; for to restore life when extinct is no less an act of creative power than to give life. It is giving life to that which before had it not, and is therefore an act which can be performed by no being but God alone. Reason, then, is competent to determine the fact whether the alleged miracle really be a miracle. It is competent, then, to the second point in the process of proof.

No less competent is it to the *third*, namely, the Divine commission of the miracle-worker. In proving the event to be a miracle, I prove it to be wrought by the power of God. Now, I know enough of God, by the natural light of reason, to know that he cannot be the accomplice of an impostor, that he cannot work a miracle by one whose word may not be taken. The miracle, then, establishes the credibility of the miracle-worker. Then the miracle-worker is what he says he is. If he says he is God, he is God ; if he says he speaks by Divine authority, he speaks by Divine authority, and we have God's authority for what he says. The third point, then, comes within the province of natural reason, and may be infallibly settled.

The *fourth* point is a simple historical question ; for it concerns what was done and said by our blessed Saviour in regard to the appointment of a body of teachers. It is to be settled historically, by consulting the proper documents and monuments in the case. It is not a question of speculation, of interpretation even, but simply a question of fact, to which reason is fully competent, and can, with proper prudence and documents, settle infallibly.

These remarks accepted, it follows that the infallible certainty we demand is possible, that is, is not *a priori* impossible. In passing from the possible to the actual, it is necessary to establish, by historical testimony, the miracles of our blessed Saviour, from which we conclude to his Divinity or Divine commission, and that he did appoint a body of teachers, commission the *Ecclesia docens*, with the promise of infallibility and indefectibility. The first the *Examiner* will concede us ; we proceed, therefore, to the proof of the second.

The question before us, distinctly stated, is, Has Jesus Christ commissioned for his Church, that is, for the congregation of the faithful, a body of pastors and teachers, and given this body the promise of infallibility and indefectibility ? If not, faith, as we have seen, is impossible, and no man can have a solid reason for the Christian hope he professes to entertain. It is, then, worth inquiring, whether we have not sufficient proof of the fact that he has commissioned such a body.

In settling this question, we shall use the New Testament, but simply as a historical document. We do this because it abridges our labor, and because the New Testament, so far as we shall have occasion to adduce it, is admitted as good authority by those against whom we are reasoning. It is their own witness, and its testimony must be conclusive against them. Moreover, its general authenticity, as a contemporary historical document, would warrant its use, even if not adduced by our adversaries.

It must not be objected to us, that, after what we have said of the necessity of an infallible authority to authenticate the canon, to quote the Bible to establish the commission in question will be to reason in a vicious circle. This is the standing Protestant objection. We do not admit it. For, 1. We do not depend on the Bible for the historical facts from which we conclude to the commission of the *Ecclesia docens*, or body of pastors and teachers ; for these facts we can collect from other

sources equally reliable, and do so collect them when we reason with unbelievers ; and 2. We do not, in this controversy, quote the Bible as an *inspired* volume, but simply as a *historical* document, and therefore not in that character in which the authority of the Church is necessary to authenticate it.

Nor, again, let it be said, that, since, in quoting the Bible to establish the point before us, we have only our private reason for interpreter, we are precluded by our own principles from quoting it at all ; for to be able from the Bible and private reason alone to deduce the faith which is the condition *sine qua non* of salvation is one thing ; to be able from the New Testament as a historical document to ascertain a simple matter of fact which it records is another and quite a different thing. Some things are clearly and expressly recorded in the Bible, and some are not. Those which are not clearly and expressly revealed are not to be infallibly ascertained without an infallible interpreter. But if we are to deduce our faith from the Bible alone, we must be able by private reason alone to ascertain these as well as the others ; for we are not to presume that Almighty God has revealed any thing superfluous, or not essential to the faith. That we can so ascertain all that is contained in the Bible we have denied, and still deny ; and so must every honest man who has ever seriously attempted the work of interpreting the Sacred Scriptures. But that there are some things in the Bible which may be infallibly ascertained, we have not denied, nor dreamed of denying. What is clearly and expressly taught in the Bible can be as easily and as infallibly ascertained as what is clearly and expressly taught in any other book ; and if all in the book were clear and express, we should no more need any interpreter, but our own reason prudently exercised, than we should for a decree of a council or a brief of the Pope. It is the character of the book itself that renders the interpreter necessary ; and the fact, that its character is such as demands an interpreter to make obvious its contents, is, to say the least, a strong presumption that Almighty God never intended it as the fountain from which we are to draw our faith by private reason alone. If he had so intended it, he would have made it so plain, so express, so definite, that no one, with ordinary prudence, could fail to catch its precise meaning. But admitting the obvious insufficiency of private reason to interpret the whole Bible, and deduce from it the faith we are required to have, we may still contend that by private reason alone we are able to determine even infallibly

some of its contents. No objection can, then, be urged against our quoting it in the present controversy, especially since we shall quote only what is clear, distinct, and express, and what all must admit to be so.

In proof of our position, that Jesus Christ has appointed, commissioned, a body of teachers with authority to teach, we quote the well known passage in St. Matthew's Gospel, xxviii. 18, 19, 20, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you all days unto the consummation of the world"; also, St. Mark, xvi. 15, "Go ye into all the earth, and preach the Gospel unto every creature"; and, Eph. iv. 11, "And some indeed he gave to be apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and others pastors and teachers."

These are conclusive as to the fact that Jesus Christ did commission a body of teachers, or institute the *Ecclesia docens*. The commission is from one who had authority to give it, because from one unto whom was given all power in heaven and in earth; it was a commission to *teach*, to teach all nations, to preach the Gospel to "every creature," — equivalent, to say the least, to all nations and individuals, — and to teach *all things whatsoever* Jesus Christ himself commanded. The commission is obviously as full, as express, as unequivocal, as language can make it, and was given by our blessed Saviour after his resurrection, immediately before his ascension.

That this was not merely a commission to the Apostles personally is evident from the terms of the commission itself, and the promise with which it closes. It was the institution and commission of a body or corporation of teachers, which, beginning with the Apostles and continuing the identical body they were, must subsist unto the consummation of the world. For they who were commissioned were commanded to teach all nations and individuals, and in the order of succession as well as in the order of coexistence; for such is the literal import of the terms. But this command the Apostles personally *did* not fulfil, for all nations and individuals, even using the term *all* to imply a moral and not a metaphysical universality, have not yet been taught; they *could* not fulfil it, for during their personal lifetime all nations and individuals were not even in existence. Then one of three things; — 1. The Apostles failed to fulfil the command of their Master; 2. Our blessed Saviour gave an imprac-

licable command ; or, 3. The commission was not to the Apostles in their personal character. We can say neither of the first two ; therefore we must say the last.

But the commission was to the Apostles, and therefore the body of teachers must, in some way, be identical with them, as is evident from the command, "Go *ye*," indisputably addressed to the Apostles themselves. But they can be identical with the Apostles in but two ways:— 1. Personally ; 2. Corporately. They are not personally identical, for that would make them the Apostles themselves, as numerical individuals, which we have just seen they are not. Then they must be corporately identical. Then the commission was to a corporation of teachers. The commission gave ample authority to teach. Therefore Jesus Christ did commission a body of teachers with ample authority to teach,—and, since commissioned to teach all nations and individuals in the order of succession as well as of coexistence, a perpetual or always subsisting corporation. Thus the very letter of the commission sustains our position.

The *promise* with which the commission closes does the same. "Behold I am with you all days unto the consummation of the world." They to whom this promise was made, and with whom the Saviour was to be present, were identical with the Apostles, for he says to the Apostles, "I am with *you*." They were to be in time, that is, in this life ; for he says, I am with you all *days*,—*πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας*,—which cannot apply to eternity, in which the divisions of time do not obtain. They were not the Apostles personally, because our blessed Saviour says again, "I am with you all days unto the *consummation of the world*," which is an event still *in futuro*, and the Apostles personally have long since ceased to exist as inhabitants of time. But they were identical with the Apostles, and, since not personally, they must be corporately identical. Therefore the promise was to be with the Apostles, as a body or corporation of teachers, all days even unto the consummation of the world. But Jesus Christ cannot be with a body that is not. Therefore the body must remain unto the consummation of the world. Therefore our blessed Saviour has instituted, appointed, commissioned, a body or corporation of teachers, identical with the Apostles, continuing their authority, and which must remain unto the consummation of the world.

The same is also established by the blessed Apostle Paul in the passage quoted from Ephesians, iv. 11, "And he indeed gave some to be apostles, and some prophets, and some

evangelists, and others to be pastors and teachers," taken in connexion with 1 Cor. xii. 28, "And God indeed hath set some in the Church, first, apostles, secondly, prophets, thirdly, teachers; after that miracles, then the graces of healings, helps, governments, kinds of tongues, interpretations of speeches." These texts, so far as we adduce them, clearly and distinctly assert that God has set in the Church, or congregation of believers, pastors and teachers as a perpetual ordinance. They prove more than this, for which at another time we may contend; but they prove at least this, which is all we are contending for now. "God hath set," "God gave to be." These expressions prove the pastors and teachers to be of Divine appointment, and therefore that they are not created or commissioned by the congregation itself. They are set in the Church, given to be, as a perpetual ordinance; for the rule for understanding any passage of Scripture, sacred or profane, is to take it always in a universal sense, unless the assertion of the passage be necessarily restricted in its application by something in the nature of the subject, or in the context, some known fact, or some principle of reason or of faith. But obviously nothing of the kind can be adduced to restrict the sense of these passages either in regard to time or space. They are, therefore, to be taken in their plain, obvious, unlimited sense. Therefore the institution of pastors and teachers is not only Divine, but universal and perpetual in the Church.

We may obtain the same result from the end for which the pastors and teachers are appointed; for the *argumentum ad quem* is not less conclusive than the *argumentum a quo*. If the end to be attained cannot be attained without assuming the authority and perpetuity of the body of pastors and teachers, we have a right to conclude to their authority and perpetuity; since they are appointed by God himself, who cannot fail to adapt his means to his ends. For what end, then, has God instituted this body of pastors and teachers? The Apostle answers, "For the perfection of the saints, for the work of the ministry, unto the edification of the body of Christ, till we all meet in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ; that we may not now be children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, in the wickedness of men, in craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive; but, performing the truth in charity, we may in all things grow up in him who is the head, Christ." Eph. iv. 12—

15. This needs no comment. The end here proposed, for which the Christian ministry is instituted, is one which always and everywhere subsists, and must so long as the world remains. But this is an end which obviously cannot be secured but by an authoritative and perpetual body of teachers. Therefore the body of teachers is authoritative and perpetual. Therefore, God, or God in Jesus Christ, has appointed, commissioned, a body of teachers, the *Ecclesia docens*, as an authoritative and perpetual corporation, to subsist unto the consummation of the world.

We have now proved the first part of our proposition, namely, the fact of the institution and commission of the *Ecclesia docens* as an authoritative and perpetual corporation of teachers. Its authority is in the commission to teach ; its perpetuity, in the fact that it cannot discharge its commission without remaining to the consummation of the world, in the promise of Christ to be with it till then, which necessarily implies its existence unto the consummation of the world, and in the fact that the promise is to it as a corporation identical with the Apostles. The proof of this first part of our proposition necessarily proves the second, namely, the *infallibility* of the corporation. The Divine commission necessarily carries with it the infallibility of the commissioned to the full extent of the commission. It is on this fact that is grounded the evidence of miracles. Miracles do not prove the truth of the doctrine taught ; they merely accredit the teacher, and this they do simply by proving that the teacher is Divinely commissioned. The fact to be established is the Divine commission. This once established, it makes no difference whether established immediately, by a miracle, or mediately, by the declaration of one already proved by miracles, as was our blessed Saviour, to speak by Divine authority. Jesus, it is conceded, spoke by Divine authority, even by those who, with the *Examiner*, deny his proper Divinity. Then a commission given by him was a Divine commission, and pledged Almighty God in like manner as if given by Almighty God himself directly. The teachers were, then, Divinely commissioned. Then in all matters covered by the commission they are infallible ; for God himself vouches for the truth of their testimony, and must take care that they testify the truth and nothing but the truth.

Moreover, the command to teach implies the obligation of obedience. The commission is a command to teach, and to teach all nations and individuals. Then all nations and indi-

viduals are bound to believe and obey these teachers ; for authority is correlative, and where there is no duty to believe and obey, there is no authority to teach. But it is repugnant to reason and the known character of God to say that God will make it the duty of any one to believe and obey a fallible teacher, one who may both deceive and be deceived. Were he to do so, he would participate in the same fallibility, and be the teacher's accomplice in error, which is impossible; for he is, as we have said, *prima veritas in essendo, in cognoscendo, et in dicendo*, and therefore can neither deceive nor be deceived. Therefore they whom he has commissioned must be infallible.

We prove the promise of infallibility also from the express testimony of the New Testament. "I will ask the Father," says the Saviour, addressing the disciples, "and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, nor knoweth him ; but you shall know him, because he shall abide with you, and be in you. . . . He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind whatsoever I shall have said to you. . . . When he, the Spirit of Truth, shall come, he shall teach you all truth ; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever things he shall hear he shall speak. He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine and declare it unto you." St. John, xiv. 16, 17, 26 ; xvi. 13, 14.

They to whom is here promised the Spirit of Truth are unquestionably the Apostles, who, we have seen, were commissioned as teachers ; but to them necessarily in their corporate capacity, as the *Ecclesia docens*, not personally, because it is said, the Paraclete shall "abide with you *for ever*." It is not to a body of teachers in general, that is, to any body of teachers which may claim to be Apostolic, that the promise is made, but to that body which is identical with the Apostles, because it is said, "he shall abide with *you*," that is, the Apostles. This identifies the subjects of this promise with the subjects of the commission before ascertained. The promise is express, and unmistakable. The Spirit of Truth was not only to abide with the teachers for ever, but was to teach them all things, and bring to their minds whatever Jesus may have said to them ; in a word, to teach them "*all truth*," that is, all truth included in the terms of the commission. If this be not a promise of infallibility, we confess we know not what would be.

The infallibility of the teachers is, then, established. But, for the special benefit of our Protestant readers, who are a little

dull of apprehension on this subject, we repeat, that we do not predicate this infallibility of the body of teachers in their natural capacity, nor of their personal endowments. It in no way, manner, or shape depends on their personal qualities or personal characters, however exalted, whether for intelligence, learning, sagacity, or sanctity. It is God speaking in and through them ; God, who can choose the foolish things of this world to confound the wise, weak things to bring to naught the mighty, nay, base things, and things that are not, and out of the mouth of babes and sucklings show forth his truth and perfect his praise ; who can make the wrath of men praise him, and even the wicked the instruments of his will and the organs of his word ; and who does do so at times, that it may be seen that his truth does not stand in human wisdom, nor his Church depend on human virtue.

For the special benefit of the same class of readers, we remark, in addition, that the infallibility claimed extends only to those matters included in the terms of the commission. These are "all things whatsoever" Jesus commands. In relation to those matters Jesus did not command, or concerning which he gave no commandment, infallibility is not claimed, and could not be established if it were. Nevertheless, from the nature of the case, the *Ecclesia docens* must be the judge of what things Jesus has commanded her to teach, and therefore unquestionably the interpreter of her own powers. To assume to the contrary would be to deny her authority while seeming to admit it. If she alone has received authority to teach, she alone can say what she has authority to teach.

The *indefectibility* of the *Ecclesia docens* follows as a necessary consequence from what has been already established. The commission is the pledge of its own fulfilment. Whatever commission God gives must be fulfilled. This must be admitted, because the commission pledges God himself. The commission was not of a body of teachers, that is, of some body of teachers who should always be found, but it was solely, exclusively, and expressly to the Apostolic ministry. It was to the identical body to whom Jesus himself spoke. He spoke to the Apostles. It was to them, and to them only, the commission was given. But it was a commission the terms of which imply that the commissioned must remain even unto the consummation of the world. But the Apostles none of them personally did so remain. Therefore, though given to them exclusively, it was not given to them in their personal character, but was

given, as we have proved, to them as a corporation or body of teachers, in which sense they may continue unto the consummation of the world ; for one of the attributes of a corporation is immortality, and, so long as the terms of its charter are observed, it is perpetuated as the same identical corporation. Now, as the commission was given to the Apostles as a corporation, it was given only to that identical corporation, continued or perpetuated in space and time, which they were. But this commission is a commission to this corporation to teach, and to teach even to the consummation of the world. Then it must exist as the identical corporation to the consummation of the world. Then it can never fail to exist, or lose its identity. The commission is a pledge of infallibility. Then it can never fail, or lose its identity as an infallible body. If it fail in neither of these respects, it is indefectible, so far as we have affirmed its indefectibility ; for we have affirmed its indefectibility only as a body of infallible teachers.

If there be any truth in the principles laid down, any reliance to be placed on the promises of Almighty God made through his Son Jesus Christ, it is infallibly certain that God has, through his Son, established an infallible and indefectible ministry, or *Ecclesia docens*, commanded it to teach all nations and individuals "all things whatsoever" he has revealed, and therefore commanded all nations and individuals to submit to it, to believe, observe, obey whatsoever it teaches as the revelation of God. The only remaining question for us is, Which of the pretended Christian ministries now extant is the true Apostolic ministry ; that is to say, which is the body of teachers that inherits the promises ? For if we find this one, we know then that it has the promise of infallibility, and that whatever it declares to be the word of God is the word of God. We can know then in whom we believe, and be certain. We need spend but a moment in answering this question. The ministry must be the identical Apostolic ministry, the identical corporation, to which the promises were made. It is the corporate identity that is to be established. It is known already, that it, at any period we may assume, is in existence ; for it is indefectible, and cannot fail. We say, then,

It is the Roman Catholic ministry. It can be no other. It cannot be the Greek Church. The Greek Church was formerly in communion with the Church of Rome, and made one corporation with it. The Church of Rome was then the true

Church, *Ecclesia docens*, or it was not. If not, the Greek Church is false, in consequence of having communed with a false Church. If it was, the Greek Church is false, because it separated from it. So, take either horn of the dilemma, the Greek Church is false, and its ministry not the Apostolic ministry which inherits the promises. The same reasoning will apply with equal force to any one of the Oriental sects not in communion with the See of Rome, and *a fortiori* to all the modern Protestant sects. Therefore the Roman Catholic ministry is the Apostolic corporation, because this corporation can be no other.

You object, in behalf of the Greek Church, that Rome separated from her, not she from Rome. This we deny. It is historically certain that the Greek Church, prior to the final separation, agreed with the Church of Rome on the matters (the Supremacy of the Pope and the Procession of the Holy Ghost) which were made the pretexts for separation. In the separation, the Greek Church denied what she had before asserted, while Rome continued to assert the same doctrine after as before. Therefore the Greek Church was the dissentient party. Prior to the separation, the Greek Church agreed with the Roman in submitting to the papal authority. In the separation, the Greek Church threw off this authority, while the Roman continued to submit to it. Therefore the Greek Church was the separatist.

You insist, that, though the act of separation may, indeed, have been formally the act of the Greek Church, yet the separation was really on the part of Rome, who had corrupted the faith, and rendered separation from her necessary to the purity of the Christian Church. But, if this be so, whatever the corruptions of the faith Rome had been guilty of, the Greek Church participated in them during her communion with Rome. If they vitiated the Latin Church, they equally vitiated the Greek. Then both had failed, and the true Church, which we have seen is indefectible, must have been somewhere else. Then the Greek Church could become a true Church by separating from the communion of the Latin Church only on condition of coming into communion with the true Church. But it came into communion with no Church. Therefore the Greek Church, at any rate, is false.

The same reasoning applies to the before mentioned Oriental sects, and *a fortiori* to Protestants. Protestants were once in communion with Rome. They were then in communion with the Church of Christ, or they were not. If they were,

they are not now, because they have separated from it. If they were not, they could come into communion with the Church of Christ only by joining the true Church. But they joined none. Therefore they are not in communion with the Church of Christ, and their pretended ministries are none of them the Apostolic ministry. Therefore, we say again, it is the Roman Catholic ministry, because it can be no other, and must be some one.

You object, that the true Church always subsists, indeed, but not always as a visible body, and therefore may be neither one nor another of the special church organizations extant, but in point of fact be dispersed through them all. But this objection is not pertinent; for we are not considering the question of the Church in the sense in which it is taken in this objection. The objection takes the word *church* in the sense of the congregation of the elect, or persons called and sanctified; we, in the question before us, take it in the sense of the congregation of Christian pastors and teachers, in which sense it can neither be invisible nor dispersed. It is the witness to the fact of revelation, and it is essential that the witness should be visible, that its competency and credibility may be judged of. It is commanded to teach all nations and individuals, and all nations and individuals are therefore commanded to believe and obey whatever it teaches. But, if invisible, this command is impracticable; for we could never know where, when, or what it teaches, and therefore whether we believed and obeyed its teachings, or not. It cannot be dispersed through various communions, because it is a corporation, and its dispersion would be its dissolution. It is a corporation of *teachers*. No man has a right to teach, unless commissioned by Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ, as we have seen, commissions individuals only in and through the commission of the body. Then one must be united to the body, as the condition of receiving a commission to teach. Therefore the teachers cannot be dispersed through different corporations. The teaching body is infallible, and, if dispersed through all communions, the truth must be infallibly taught in all communions. But it is so taught only in one communion; because all communions differ among themselves, and could not differ had they no error. As no two can be found that agree, only one can have the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Therefore the ministry in question is only one, and not dispersed. It cannot be dispersed; for, if it were, it could not answer the end of its institution, which is to maintain unity of faith, perfect the saints in the knowledge of the Son of God,

and prevent us from being children tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine ; for to secure this end it must be public, recognizable, one, uniform, and authoritative. Nor could the individual teacher ever verify his commission, as a teacher sent from God, unless he can point to the visible body of which he is a member, and which was commissioned by Jesus Christ, and from him inherits the promises. Therefore we dismiss this notion of the invisible Church, and of an invisible body of true Christian teachers dispersed through various and conflicting communions. Such teachers would be as good as none, for no one could distinguish them from false teachers.

We repeat, then, the Roman Catholic ministry is the Apostolic ministry, for this ministry can be no other. This conclusion very few, perhaps none, would deny, if they admitted, what we have proved, that Jesus Christ did institute such a ministry as we contend for. If there be an infallible Church, authorized by the Saviour to teach, all must say, it is indisputably the Roman Catholic Church ; for all see it can be no other, and, in fact, no other even pretends to be it.

But we may prove our proposition not merely by the removal or destruction of the negative, but by plain, positive, affirmative evidence. The first method of proof is conclusive in itself ; the second is also conclusive in itself. All that is to be done to prove the proposition affirmatively is, to identify the Roman Catholic ministry, as a corporation, with the corporation Jesus Christ instituted and commissioned in the persons of the Apostles. The kind of evidence needed is the same as is requisite in any case of the identification of a corporation. The identity is established by showing that the corporation retains its original name, and has regularly succeeded to the original corporators. The *name* is not conclusive evidence, but is a presumption of identity. In the present case, it is easy to prove that the ministry in question retains the Apostolic name. This name is *Catholic*, and the Roman Catholic Church bears it, and always has borne it. It is and always has been known and distinguished by it, and no other corporation is or ever has been known or distinguished by it. The old Donatists claimed it, but could not appropriate it. They are known only as *Donatists*. Some members of the English and American Episcopal Church, now and then, put on airs, and with great emphasis call themselves *Catholics* ; but the bystanders only smile, for they see the long ears peering out from under the lion's skin. While, on the other hand, go into any city in the

world and ask the first lad you meet to direct you to the *Catholic* Church, and he will direct you without hesitation to the *Roman Catholic* Church. This shows, that, by the common judgment and consent of mankind, the distinctive appellation of the Churches in communion with the See of Rome is *Catholic*.

The regular succession of the Roman Catholic ministry to the Apostolic is easily made out. We can establish the regular succession of pontiffs from St. Peter to Gregory the Sixteenth, the present Pope ; and this establishes the unity of the corporation in time, and therefore its identity. The regular succession and unity of authority of the corporation can also be established in the orders and mission of the pastors ; for the Catholic ministry has never been schismatic. This regular succession and unity of authority establishes, of course, the identity of the corporation. Then the Catholic ministry is identical with the Apostolic ministry. The two points on which this conclusion depends we leave, of course, without adducing in detail the historical proof of them. Established historically, they warrant the conclusion. They can be established by conclusive historical proof. Therefore the conclusion stands firm.

We establish our proposition, then, by showing that the Apostolic ministry *can* be no other than the Roman Catholic, and by showing that it *is* the Roman Catholic. Nothing more conclusive than this double proof can be desired. Then we sum up by repeating, that Jesus Christ has instituted and commissioned an infallible and indefectible body of teachers, and this body is the congregation of the Roman Catholic pastors in communion with their chief. The Catholic Church, then, is the witness to the fact of revelation. What its pastors declare to be the word of God is the word of God ; what they enjoin as the faith is the faith without which it is impossible to please God, and without which we are condemned and the wrath of God abideth on us. What they teach is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth ; for God himself has commissioned them, and will not suffer them to fall into error in what concerns the things they have been commissioned to teach.

The question of the Church as the congregation of believers can detain us but a moment. We agree with the *Examiner*, that the Church in this sense embraces "the whole company of believers, the uncounted and wide-spread congregation of all those who receive the Gospel as the law of life ; that the Church of Christ comprehends and is composed of all his followers." But who are these ? " My sheep," says our blessed Lord, " hear

my voice and follow me." We must hear his voice, as the condition of following him, or being his followers. But we cannot hear his voice where it is not, where it speaks not. Where, then, speaks his voice? In the Catholic Church, in and through the Catholic pastors, and nowhere else. Then we hear his voice only as we hear the voice of the Catholic Church, and follow him only as we follow what this Church in his name commands. Only they, then, who hear and obey the Catholic Church are of the Church, — only they who are in the communion of this Church are in the communion of Christ. It is time, then, to abandon No-Churchism, and to return to the one fold of the one Shepherd, and submit ourselves to the guidance of the pastors he has made rulers and teachers of the flock.

We do not suppose this conclusion will be very pleasing to our Protestant readers, and we do not suppose any thing we could say, conscientiously, would please them; for we do not see any right they have to be pleased, standing where they do. There is the stubborn fact, that "no man can be saved who has not God for his father, and the Church for his mother," which cannot be got over; and if we have not the true Church for our mother, then "are we bastards and not sons." The presumption, to say the least, is strongly against our Protestant brethren; and they have great reason to fear, that, after all, they are only "children of the bondwoman." They may try to hide this from themselves, and to stifle the voice of conscience by crying out "Popery!" "Papism!" "Romanism!" "Idolatry!" "Superstition!" and the like, but this can avail them little. They may make light of the question, and think themselves excused from considering it. But there comes and must come to the greater part of them an hour when they feel the need of something more substantial than any thing they have. They may use swelling words, and speak in a tone of great confidence; but the best of them have their doubts, nay, long periods when they can keep up their courage, and persuade themselves that they hope, only by shutting their eyes, refusing to think, plunging into religious dissipation, or giving way to the wild and destructive bursts of fanaticism and superstition. The great question of the salvation of the soul must at times press heavily upon them, and create no little anxiety. For it is a terrible thing to be forced into the presence of God uncovered by the robe of the Redeemer's righteousness, — a terrible thing to have all the sins of our past life come thronging back on the memory, and to feel that they are registered against us, unrepented of,

unforgiven ; a terrible thing to feel that the number of these sins is daily and hourly increasing, that we ourselves are continually exposed to the allurements of the world, the seductions of the flesh, and the temptations of the devil, with no weapon but our own puny arm with which to defend ourselves, and no strength but our own infirmity with which to recover and maintain our integrity. Alas ! we know what this is. We know what it is to feel oppressed with the heavy load of guilt, to struggle alone in the world, against all manner of enemies, without faith, without hope, without the help of God's sacraments ; we know what it is to feel that we must trust in our own arm and heart, stand on the pride of our own intellect and conviction. We know, too, what it is to feel all these defences fail, all this trust give way ; for to us have come, as well as to others, those trying moments when the loftiest are laid low, and the proudest, prostrate in the dust, cry out from the depth of their spiritual agony, " Is there no help ? O God ! why standest thou afar off ? Help, help, or I perish ! " Alas ! there are moments when we cannot trifle, when we cannot lean on a broken reed, when we *must* have something really Divine, something on which we can lay hold that will not break, and leave us to drop into everlasting perdition. It is a terrible question this of the salvation of the soul, and no man can prudently put it off. It must be met and answered, and the sooner the better.

We urge this upon our Protestant brethren. They have no solid ground on which to stand, no sure help on which to rely. Their own restlessness proves it ; their perpetual variations and shifting of their creeds prove it ; the new and strange sects constantly springing up amongst them prove it ; their worldly-mindedness, their universal ill-at-case, perpetual striving after what they have not, and find not, prove it ; the wide-spread infidelity which prevails among them, and the still more destructive indifference prove it. Their spiritual strength is the strength of self-confidence or of desperation. They cannot live so. There is no good for them in their present state. Why will they not ask if there be not a better way ? If they will but seek, they shall find, — knock, it shall be opened to them. There is that faith which they deny, and that certainty which they ridicule. But they will find it not in their pride. They will find it not, till they learn to look on him they have despised, and to fly for succour to him they have crucified. But we have been betrayed into remarks, which, though true, would come with a better grace from one whose faith is less recent than our own. Yet

we have said nothing by way of vain-glory. If we have faith, it is no merit of ours. We have been brought by a way we knew not, and by a Power we dared not resist; and His the praise and the glory, and ours the shame and mortification that for so many years we groped in darkness, boasting that we could see, and holding up our farthing-candle of a misguided reason as a light that was to enlighten the world!

We have been asked, "How in the world have you become a Catholic?" In this essay we have presented an outline, or rather a specimen, of the answer we have to give. It is incomplete; but it will satisfy the attentive reader, that not without some show of reason, at least, have we left our former friends and the endearing associations of our past life, and joined ourselves to a Church which excites only the deadly rage of the great mass of our countrymen. The change with us is a great one, and a greater one than the world dreams of, or will dream of, and one which may have cost some sacrifice. At any rate, it is a change we would not have made, if we could have helped it,—a change against which we struggled long, but for which, though it makes us a pilgrim and a sojourner in life, and permits us no home here below, we can never sufficiently praise and thank our God. It is a great gain to lose even earth for heaven. If, however, we be pressed to give the full reason of our change, we must refer to the grace of God, and the need we felt of saving our own soul. We were a sinner, and we wished to be reconciled to God.

ART. II. — *Onguent contre la Morsure de la Vipère Noire*, composé par le Dr. Evariste Gypendole, Ancien Chirurgien Major de la Vieille Garde, Médecin Consultant du Roi de Lahore, Grande-Croix de la Légion d'Honneur, &c., &c. Paris. 1843. 16mo. pp. 218.

THE great necessity of some specific for the bite of the Black Serpent has long been felt by all who regard their own lot as bound up with that of their race, and hold that the most effectual atonement they can make for their own sins is to lighten the afflictions of their brethren. The black serpent is the most venomous of all the serpent brood, and the most deadly

enemy of the human race ; and all the more dangerous, as he gives us no warning of his approach, and bites us without our perceiving it. We see nothing, feel nothing, suspect nothing, till the virus has entered the system, and penetrated to the seat of life.

What is peculiarly distressing is, that the animal, in modern times, seems to have received an almost supernatural power of reproduction. It has become prolific beyond all former precedent. The whole land becomes infested. Black serpents swarm everywhere. They are found in the palace and the hovel, the court and the camp, in the halls of justice, and even in the temples consecrated to religion. No place is impervious to their approach. They spare neither age, sex, nor condition. In some countries, the whole population seems to have been bitten, and exhibit all the madness and rage which never fail to follow the venomous bite. Naturalists do not agree as to the cause of this increased fecundity of this venomous reptile in modern times, or of the greater virulence of its poison ; but all admit the fact, which is otherwise incontrovertibly established. Some think it belongs to the nature of the animal itself ; others think the cause is to be found in human nature. These last say, the animal lives on the human race, and obtains from the bite the means of its subsistence. Human nature, they continue, is subjected to certain periodical developments, and in some of these developments it furnishes the appropriate food for the black serpent, and in others it does not. We chance to live in one of those epochs in the development of humanity peculiarly favorable to the family of black serpents. How this may be we know not ; but this we do know, that no small part of Europe and America swarms with the hateful brood, and is wasted by its ravages.

This greater fecundity of the species was first noted, in modern times, in Germany and some of the Swiss cantons, about three hundred years ago. Black serpents at that epoch were found to have become incredibly numerous. They soon infested several of the provinces of France, took entire possession of the Dutch Netherlands, and crossed the North Sea over into Great Britain, where they appeared to find themselves, as the Germans say, at home (*zu Heim*). The consternation they produced can hardly be described. For a time, it was feared none would escape the fatal bite. But Providence interposed. They found their limits in Germany, beyond which they could not extend ; the French attacked them with their accustomed

vivacity and courage, and sensibly diminished their numbers; Italy, Spain, and some other countries, went far towards expelling them altogether from their dominions. There was a short breathing-spell in the seventeenth century, and men began to hope that the race would be wholly exterminated. Vain hope! The race had found a home in England, where it grew and multiplied at an incredible rate. Having become completely *Anglicized*, and having in consequence changed, in some measure, its appearance and habits, so as not to be immediately recognized, it recrossed the North Sea, reappeared in Germany, and especially in France, in greater numbers and more venomous than ever. Not contented with the Old World, it found its way to the New World, where it finds itself hardly less at home than in England herself.

From the latest accounts received, it would appear, that, though numerous in Germany, the increase of black serpents is there arrested; in France, which for seventy years seemed given up entirely to their ravages, the bites are much less frequent than they were. It is even rumored that there is some hope for England herself. Nice observers think they perceive a change in the English climate, producing a corresponding change in the temperament of the English people, unfavorable to this peculiar species of reptiles. Some have whispered, that the English, becoming at length aware of the utter impossibility of living with these reptiles, which, from some strange fancy, they had for a long time cherished, and carried in their bosoms, have even thought of resorting to certain prescriptions against their bite, said to have been left by one St. Patrick, and carefully preserved by some of the old women in a neighbouring island. But this wants confirmation. Nevertheless, it is quite certain that the English are consulting on the ways and means, either of deriving more advantage from the race than they have heretofore done, or of driving it from their dominions. We in this country, however, do not seem to be particularly alarmed at the incredible numbers of black serpents we are sustaining, nor do we seem to apprehend that any injury can come from their bite. Yet they are exceedingly destructive, and their bite with us in almost all cases proves fatal. Very few of us escape. We can scarcely rear up a clever boy to the age of twelve years, without his being bitten in the heel, the breast, and the head. The great mass of the young men and maidens in our cities, if not in the country, show unequivocal signs of having been bitten. The virus has been received, and is work-

ing in the system. They themselves now and then suspect all is not quite right with them ; they are ill-at-ease, are troubled with insomnies, cannot remain long in one place, have great aversion to whatever demands serious thought, firm will, and persevering action. They resort to all manner of quacks and nostrums, but obtain no relief, and no clue to the nature of their ailments, or the means of cure.

But, happily, the means are at length discovered, if not of exterminating the whole race, yet of radically, effectually, curing those who may be bitten, and of rendering all henceforth invulnerable to the attacks of the black serpent. Dr. Gypendole, author of the book before us, a celebrated physician, as is evinced by his titles, having given up his entire life to the investigation of the subject, has discovered and compounded a *salve* which will in all cases, if applied, prove effectual, and not only in cases of recent date, but in those of long standing. He has not only discovered and compounded the *salve*, “the precious ointment,” but, with a praiseworthy disinterestedness, has disclosed the secret of its composition, and the method of its application, to the world; proving thereby, that, if, to suit the manners of the age, he assumes the style and address of a mountebank, he is no quack. He asks no premium for the discovery, no reward for the disclosure. Enough for him the consciousness of contributing something to lighten the afflictions of suffering humanity, and the blessings which must for ever attend his memory.

We assure our readers that Dr. Gypendole’s *salve* is no quack medicine, and that the good Doctor, as extravagant as he may appear to be in its praise, does not by any means exaggerate its virtues. We speak from experience. We ourselves had the misfortune to be bitten by the black serpent more than once, and badly bitten, too ; but the application of this *salve*, according to the Doctor’s prescription, has wrought a total and radical cure, to which fact we are ready to make affidavit before any justice of the peace, and at any moment, if any one chooses to doubt our simple word. But we must let the Doctor speak for himself. Our readers must, then, figure to themselves a venerable old man,—well dressed, but not in a fashion too modern, with a high and expanded forehead, a large, well-formed head, slightly bald, locks white as the driven snow, face somewhat wrinkled, but wearing a calm, placid, benevolent smile, winning the heart of every child that sees him,—driving up in a public square, descending from his carriage, and ascend-

ing a platform raised a few feet from the ground, and opening his mouth to address the crowd which instantly collects to see and hear him.

“I. PROPERTIES OF THE SALVE.

“Gentlemen and Ladies,—You are going to see what you are going to see,—a wonderful thing which you have never yet seen. And yet, as to beasts, men, inventions, remedies, what have you not seen? You have seen learned dogs playing at chess, as the late Mr. Talleyrand at protocols; military fleas going through all points of their exercise, fit to form the first battery of the mounted artillery of the brave National Guard of Paris, in whose ranks we are all subject to march; you have seen artists in verse, in prose, in legislation, in philosophy, who, though their eyes are armed with double glasses, cannot distinguish clearly the end of their own noses, and who yet flatter themselves that they can see quite well in the clouds; you have seen white calves with two heads, and *tricolored* knights with four, eight, ten, thirteen consciences; the fourteen thousand truths of the Constitutional Charter; the ashes of the great Napoleon; bitumen of every sort and color, granitic bitumen, vitrifiable bitumen, bituminous bitumen; bear’s grease from Siberia, taken from the living animal, to promote the growth of the hair, the eyebrows, and the beard; cabbage-seed from Iceland, producing a vegetable tall as a drum-major. All these you have seen, and yet, Gentlemen and Ladies, I have the honor to tell you again that you are going to see—what you are going to see,—a wonderful thing surpassing all you have yet seen. I myself,—who have visited all the capitals of Europe,—Paris, London, Petersburg, Madrid, Lisbon on the Tagus, Rome, Naples, Berlin, Vienna on the Danube;—all parts of the world,—Europe, Asia, Africa, America, Oceanea,—I myself have nowhere seen what you are going to see.

“Look here, Gentlemen and Ladies; in this little box which I hold between my thumb and forefinger is a wonderful thing, which our contemporaries of all countries, not excepting even the illustrious Laplanders and the scientific Mantchouck Tartars, as well as our ancestors of all times,—jaw-bones, fossil, antediluvians, preadamites,—have never suspected. It is so, Gentlemen and Ladies. This box contains wonderful pills, the discovery of which I owe to the immense progress which has been made in chemical science, combined with long years of labor during ten hours a day, not even excepting Sundays. I will not, indeed, say, as say some persons who advertise certain specifics endowed with the marvellous property of curing all diseases, past, present,

future, old and new, that my salve is a universal panacea. No, I am not — and you need not that I say it — no, I am not — a quack. At my age, one's fortune is made, or left to shift for itself. The sole desire of curing one of the innumerable maladies which afflict poor humanity has made me for these ten years travel through town and country, in Europe and America, and procures me the inestimable advantage of appearing this day before this amiable assembly. No, I will not say to you that my salve is a universal specific; for it is the first duty of a man of honor to tell the truth; and, moreover, as says Confucius, *true merit is modest*. I repeat, then, that my salve cures neither the whooping-cough nor the gout, neither the gastro-enteritis, nor diseases of the tongue, nor even diseases of the skin. But it does more; it cures the almost universally fatal bite of the black serpent, the most dangerous of all known reptiles, — and cures a new bite, an old bite, a bite in the heart, or a bite in the head, and instantaneously, radically, and without pain. And what is better yet, a thousand times better, it renders those who are so happy as to possess it invulnerable to the attacks of this fearful reptile. Simply take a box of my salve, merely inhale its perfume, and you may travel in all places infested by the black serpent, visit night and day the miserable victims of its contagious bites, with as much assurance as the doctor who visits the pest-house with a cruise of the *vinaigre* of the four ministers — I beg pardon — of the *four thieves*, under his nose.

“ But in order the better to appreciate the great value of my specific, this amiable society doubtless demands some detailed account of the black serpent, to the cure of whose bite I have consecrated my life. I hasten to satisfy its very reasonable demand.

“ II. IDEA OF THE BLACK SERPENT — ITS HABITS.

“ In the outset, Gentlemen and Ladies, I warn this amiable society not to expect from me a direct definition of the black serpent. I leave the rage for definitions to the Chinese philosophers; for, according to the beautiful maxim of the great Paraphragus, first dragoman to his Highness Abduhl-Medjid, *definitions usually satisfy only those who make them*. However, I will make this dangerous reptile known to you, but less by telling you what it is than by telling you what it is not. You must know, then, Gentlemen and Ladies, that the black serpent does not belong to the picturesque race of lynxes, although these have many varieties, especially in Central Europe; nor to the very delicate class of black or white bears, notwithstanding these are vastly more numerous than naturalists imagine; nor to the family of apes, in which the wonderful progress of science has succeeded in detecting one hundred four score and nineteen thousand varieties; nor to the race of fowls, whose species are as numerous as the leaves of the forest, such as cock-turkeys

of all sizes and colors, red parrots, green parrots, blue parrots, lead, copper, silver, and gold-colored parrots; one-eyed magpies, thievish magpies, lying magpies, speckled magpies with a crest, speckled magpies with spurs, speckled magpies with a tail. But I perceive, that, in order to define the black serpent by explaining its relations and differences with all the creatures of the three kingdoms, animal, vegetable, and mineral, I must display a knowledge of natural history which may not be quite familiar to every member of this amiable assembly, and the celebrated Doctor Nighpho-tse, the patriarch of Chinese literature, says, with profound wisdom and truth, that *every man, not a fool or a knave, should speak so as to be understood. I suffer*, he elsewhere says, *only learned Europeans to speak Greek in English*. You will bear in mind, then, Gentlemen and Ladies, that the black serpent is not a lion, an eagle, a dog, a cat, or a tape-worm, although it has a certain resemblance to this last. In what category, then, shall it be placed? — pp. 1–11.

The Doctor proceeds, and finally asserts that the black serpent is an *amphibious* animal. Having observed for a long time its habits in Germany, England, France, North and South America, he is convinced that its usual resort is the marshes, and, although sometimes seen unrolling its hideous folds on dry land, it for the most part burrows in the mud. It feeds mainly on little dry and grayish leaves of stunted shrubs, known in science under the names of the *Presse* (*hupas fœtidum*), the *Débats* (*hupas judaicum*), the *Siècle* (*hupas putrido-acetosum*), the *Constitutionnel* (*hupas antiquatum*), names which, with a singular coincidence, seem to have been adopted by the leading Parisian journals. Its food, however, varies according to its age. Young, it prefers Béranger, Pigault-Lebrun, Parny; older, it selects Universitarians, Broussais, Soulié, Balzac, Janin, Hugo, Sue, Kock, George Sand, and other spongy productions, designated by the generic name of *pantheisto-immorali-opacum*. On rare occasions, it nibbles Voltaire, Rousseau, Strauss, Volney, and Holbach, — azotic plants of the class fossil sleep, bearing thistles (*azotico-fossili-somniferum*). Dr. Gypendole is unquestionably in the main correct in his account of the habits of this pernicious reptile, and yet we think he has described them more especially as he has observed them in the French metropolis. Its food and even its repairs undergo some change in passing from one age or one country to another, although in general pretty much the same in all times and places, — in the garden where it coiled on the Tree of Knowledge, and our good city of Boston,

where it has just found a place for hatching its brood in the *Melodeon*. But we proceed to let the learned and scientific Doctor describe, in his own inimitable manner, the effects of the bite of the black serpent, — or rather, its diagnostics.

“III. BITE OF THE BLACK SERPENT — ITS REPAIRS.

“The Creator, Gentlemen and Ladies, as it was learnedly observed four thousand years ago by Nangazaki, the great philosopher of Japan, — *the Creator has placed in this world a wonderful variety of beasts*. Amongst them all, — if we except certain bipeds having neither tails nor feathers, according to the definition, so profoundly true, of the illustrious Diogenes, — there is not one so hideous, and at the same time so dangerous, not one that inspires the human heart with so much dread, repugnance, and horror, as those of the reptile kind. Now I assert, and with deep conviction, too, that the black serpent is of all reptiles the most dangerous, the most foul, the most repulsive. Does my amiable audience require proof of what I advance? Let them listen to what I have to say concerning the nature of its venom.

“You imagine, perhaps, Gentlemen and Ladies, that it infects the blood. Not at all; you’re wrong. That it vitiates the animal spirits. Wrong again. It does worse; it does a thousand times worse; it infects the heart and vitiates the brain. It makes a man mad; and so mad that you may order forthwith a strait jacket; wicked, so wicked that he’s fit only for the halter. I can hardly describe its lamentable effects better than by laying before this honorable society an imperfect sketch of the sad spectacle which I myself witnessed a few months ago.

“In the course of my long peregrinations over the old and new continents, I chanced to arrive in a vast kingdom, situated about fifteen hundred leagues from the territory of the Iroquois. The black serpent is there in swarms, and I saw numberless poor wretches infected by its venom. The first that came under my observation had been bitten in the head. You have heard the false and discordant sounds which a violin gives when its cords are unstrung. All that is nothing compared to the extravagant ideas that issued from their diseased brains. They imagined that they had become — what do you think, Ladies and Gentlemen? — princes? O, no! Kings? Not that either. Emperors? You’re out again. Trifles like these are the fancies of our common fools, such as one sees at Charenton, Bicêtre, and like places. But mine belonged to a higher class, and were not so easily satisfied. They believed themselves — come, guess once more! Do you give it up? In their great modesty, they believed themselves to be — gods! nothing more nor less!!

"There they were, rubbing their hands with delight, and shouting out, to the tune of the *Carmagnole*, 'Go ahead! go ahead! God is done for, — Christianity is gone, — dead and buried. Bravo! now we'll put the world to rights!' Then, with a degree of grave solemnity the most laughable that can be imagined, had not their madness concerned a matter so important, they set to work to prop up their infant godship, by endeavouring to prove that the God whom we adore had come to naught.

"One young man, of low stature, who possessed the singular advantage — although not singular in that country — of having but one eye and that purblind, whose brow was furrowed with premature wrinkles, and whom, with a broad-skirted green coat, a hat somewhat *à la militaire*, and very large spectacles, I seem to see before me now, capered about, shouting incessantly, 'What a smash! I can count seventy-two solecisms in the moon. God was nothing but a booby, when he undertook to create the world. He's used up now; it's all over.'

"Another, — a tall, spare man, with pallid countenance, and voice harsh and tremulous, not unlike the cry of a goat, — an antediluvian pedagogue, the true Napoleon of all absurdities, — repeated unceasingly, with the solemn monotony of a pendulum, 'Silence! silence, stupid human race! thou hast mistaken for God a man who knew not a word of rhetoric. I can prove to you, book in hand, that Jesus Christ never read two pages of my *Treatise on the Art of Oratory*, Amsterdam, princeps edition, 1838. Who'll answer that?'

"Another, dressed in a blue cloak, with a great number of ribbons and gewgaws paraded about his neck and breast, cried out, with a stentorian voice, 'To the vote, Gentlemen! to the vote! the Gospel is inadmissible, except with an amendment. To the vote! to the vote!' Immediately there was a shout from all sides, 'Adopted. God is completely upset! adopted, — and we only are Gods! Adopted. Hats off, mortals, and down upon your knees!'

"At these words, a cry of 'Order, order!' was heard from another group close by. In the centre appeared a middle-aged man, a head taller than the rest. His costume was Scottish, crossed all over with silvery-looking palms and forms of trans-rhenish syllogisms. He was praying devoutly, with his eyes fixed upon himself; the others were all agog, listening to him. I was exceedingly curious to find out his name, when some one whispered in my ear, 'That's the Grand Lama of the *me* and the *not-me*.' 'O God!' spoke out then the pontiff to himself, as it were, 'hear them not, for they are fools: *thy being has naught that is exclusive*; thou art not, as they, *me* and *not-me*: thou art the universal *me*: yea, thou art thyself, objecting thyself *infinitely* to thyself: and man and nature are thyself, objecting thee *finitely* to thyself: thou art we, and we are thou: eternity is thyself, time thyself, space thyself, number thyself, totality thyself: all is but thee: for in thee all is *me* and naught *not-me*.'

"This devout and most lucid prayer drew down thunders of applause. For my own part, all that I could understand from it was, that I had met with a class of madmen who had less egotism than the preceding. They thought themselves gods, to be sure; but at least they were willing to share their godship with other beings." — pp. 17–23.

The author then exposes, in his own peculiar manner, the system of Pantheism, which doles out the Divinity by the yard, as it were, assigning its due portion to every sort of being. The manner in which he describes the perfect anarchy of opinions brought about by atheistic philosophy is inimitable.

"A little farther on, I fell in with a large crowd, and, entering into the midst of them, said, in the politest tone possible, 'Gentlemen, may I be permitted to ask to what family you belong?' A dozen tongues broke loose at once: 'To the family of machines, booby, — brothers to windmills, and cousins to patent turnspits.' 'That's not true,' said a dozen others; 'we belong to the branch of elastic and digesting tubes, open at both ends.' 'False, false!' cried out others; 'we are all of the finny tribe; fishes from father to son; carps arrived at the full development of perfectibility, consisting in the original *plus* the hair, *minus* the tail.'

"All maintained their ambitious pretensions with great vehemence of speech and gesture. Such confusion, such noise and racket, was enough to set all the dogs in the country barking. From words they came to thumps. Insults from one side were answered by blows from the other; which amounts to what the great Aristotle calls the *ultima ratio regum*; an expression that may be translated, for your especial benefit, Ladies, *the first principle of morality amongst wolves*.

"Very soon the fight became general. The gods ran up, espousing some one side, some another. What a mournful scene did I behold! The wretched victims of the viperian poison, in paroxysms of rage, shouted, pounded, rolled their eyes in frenzy, ran their tongues out, argued by kicks and cuffs, howled, barked, caterwauled, bellowed, till at length they were covered with wounds, blood, and dirt, and the field became a second Waterloo. I was told that such scenes as I have just described occur frequently every week. You may call it, Ladies and Gentlemen, a drama, melodrama, tragedy, or comedy, as you please; but it is what I call *a lesson of philosophy*. Much affected by this sight, I left these, and moved on to the quarters of the *modest*. They are so called because they acknowledge that they are not quite gods. Here an old man, with powdered wig, broad ruffles on his bosom and wrists, and large shoe-buckles, accosted me. 'We're aware of it,' said he; 'the Supreme Being does exist; but he is a gentleman who sleeps all night, and dozes all day in an arm-chair. The act of

creation exhausted all his strength. He cast this world into the immensity of space, like a balloon in the air, or a ship without helmsman on the ocean.— There, go ahead, on your own hook, as well as you can,' said he; and, returning to his apartment, he gave the key a double turn, and locked the door."— pp. 25 - 28.

In the following paragraph the good Doctor portrays with much wit and truth the moral corruption which is the necessary consequence of a belief in Deism, and the frivolity of those occupations and aims which are all that is left to man, when he has no God whom he is bound to serve, and no future destiny to strive for. He then passes to the second class of victims.

"The second category of patients that I found in the same kingdom, fifteen hundred leagues from the country of the Iroquois, comprises those who had been bitten in the region of the heart. But before I proceed, my love for suffering humanity will not allow me, Gentlemen and Ladies, to withhold from you one observation which is essential. I have verified it nine thousand eight hundred and fifty-nine times, in the course of my long medical career. Whereas the *cobra-capelo* aims at a man's nose, and the rattlesnake at his calf, if he has any, the black serpent attacks invariably and exclusively the head and the heart. Moreover, I have always found, of a hundred patients, that ninety-nine and a half were first wounded in the heart, and that, as a general rule, the brain suffers only from sympathy.

"This being premised, Gentlemen and Ladies, I proceed. By the bite of the black serpent, the heart is decomposed, and its very nature changed; all its movements are henceforth downwards, instead of upwards. What was before sweet as honey to the patient's palate is now bitter as wormwood; the food of common people is disgusting, and he flies from it with as much horror as a mad dog from a bucket of cold water. Only mention to him the name of sweetmeats, pastries, and all those nice tit-bits that make the mouth of any civilized man water, and you make him retch with nausea, — you are sure of giving him cramp in the stomach, or convulsions. Give him meats fit for kings or for the gods themselves, let them be served on a table covered with cloths white as the snow of Caucasus; he dives under the table, devours the most disgusting garbage, gnaws bones like a dog, and, instead of quaffing nectar from golden goblets, he prefers to lie down flat by the roadside, and guzzle muddy water from the gutter."— pp. 30 - 32.

These various speeches which the Doctor Evariste de Gypendole places in the mouths of his mad patients, and which fit there so well, our readers may suspect are in reality the substance of different systems of infidel philosophy which have all had their day, and many of which are still greatly in vogue.

Granting the suspicions of our readers to be well founded, we must say, the Doctor does them no injustice ; and the arguments by which they would subvert Christian faith, the only sure basis of true philosophy, when stripped of the brilliancy and ornaments of style by which their authors have embellished them, when analyzed and reduced to a bare, simple proposition, after all, mean precisely what was uttered by the victims of the black serpent, and nothing more. Some of them, in fact, are taken almost textually from the writings of these authors.

In the following chapter, the learned, scientific, and humane Doctor proceeds to narrate his labors and trials in pursuit of a remedy for the bite of the black serpent, and the rare providence by which he hit upon the principle which led to the discovery and composition of his incomparable salve. It is full of interest, wit, humor, and hits at all manner of quacks and quack nostrums, moral, philosophical, social, political ; all of which our readers may well believe are home-thrusts — at somebody. They know already enough of our Doctor to believe that Doctor Evariste de Gypendole is, in very deed, as he says, no quack, although ignorant of none of the various species of quackery in vogue or out of vogue. The search was long and painful, and the laborious Doctor seems at times to have almost despaired of success ; but at length, through the blessing of a good Providence, success crowned his labors, — the incomparable salve was discovered, and the black serpent henceforth rendered harmless as a dove. We should be glad to follow the Doctor in this search, — a more notable one than the search after the philosopher's stone, — but we hasten to the composition of the salve itself.

“ V. COMPOSITION OF THE SALVE.

“ You are convinced, I trust, Gentlemen and Ladies, that I have no inclination to gull the public or take advantage of its simplicity. You might as well make a French peer of the respectable dean of the Royal Academy of Medicine at Paris, as to confound my precious salve with a host of quack nostrums, of which the wonderful virtue is proclaimed to the world every day by a venal press, with great flourishes of drums and trumpets. An enlightened public knows how to discern, *cuique suum*. We know how to detect all these Parisian catch-pennies, patented as they may be. *Virtus post nummos*, as that experienced man, the great poet of Tibur, has sung ; that is to say, Ladies, ‘ *Truth, virtue, and honor, after dollars and cents.*’ This is the motto adopted by the authors of such

fraudulent speculations. But, you know it well, Gentlemen and Ladies, such is not the motto of Doctor Evariste. No, no, he's a different man; and, as a proof of his disinterested honesty, hear my declaration. This salve, so wonderful in its effects, — this salve, of which the discovery has cost me fifty years of labor and journeying, I now deliver up gratuitously and without charge to the public. Judge for yourselves, before you use it; for, without any sort of mystery, I am going to make you acquainted with all the elements which compose it, and give you full directions for its use.

“In the first place, *A Jove principium*, as Virgil says, — which may signify, Ladies, *To cook a hare, first catch a hare*, — I begin by hunting out, in the stagnant pools where they hatch, black serpents of all sizes, old and young and middle-aged, and even not yet hatched. When caught, I chop their heads off. That is to say, Gentlemen and Ladies, in Catholic Apostolic Roman language, I dig out infidelity wherever it has nested itself: I cut off its head, by taking its own objections against Christianity, of whatever kind they may be, past, present, future, old, new, *flat*, or horned, to the right or to the left, up or down: I gather them from the mouth of the beardless youth or the whiskered man, from the parlour and the workshop, from the head and tail of the philosophical army; objections in rhyme and prose, from every language and gibberish; objections from big books and little books, from huge folios covered with dust, and from perfumed pamphlets: I place them all in a mortar hermetically sealed, so that no part can evaporate, — a necessary precaution. The result produced by trituration is a greasy lump, which, being placed in the alembic, conveys into my receiver the quintessence of the whole, which I am going now to present you.

“In its dogma, Christianity is but a tissue of myths, of fables, of inconsistencies revolting to our reason. It teaches that Jesus Christ is God: absurd! That he was born of a mother ever virgin: absurd! That there is but one God, and in this one nature three distinct persons: absurd! That this God foresees all things, and whatever he foresees happens infallibly; and yet man is a free agent: absurd! That this God is all, and yet man is something: absurd! That for a sin of a single moment, this God, whom Christianity still calls good, punishes a frail creature with an eternity of torments: absurd! That all men are born with the guilt of a sin committed by their first parent: absurd! That the Son of God, coming into this world, was born in a stable; that he died upon a cross, between two thieves: absurd! That he and his Apostles performed miracles: absurd, too! since the laws of nature are immutable, and the Apostles were only stupid fools, the first Christians idiots who believed whatever they were told, without examining, without reasoning, — carried away by a fanatic love of glory and of novelty. In fine, Christianity, viewed in its dogma, whether by parts or in a lump, is nothing but a long string of absurdities.

“You perceive, Gentlemen and Ladies, that my chemical operation has been quite successful; the ingredients have lost nothing of their strength; and all these black serpents’ heads, or, theologically, all the objections of infidelity against the Christian dogma, when cut off, hacked, triturated, and distilled, furnish us with the quintessence of all the sophisms written, said, sung, or howled, from Celsus down to Voltaire and his latest posterity, born or to be born. Having proceeded thus far, I inscribe: **DOGMA OF CHRISTIANITY, TOTAL ABSURDITY.** And there’s one point settled.

“Now for its morality. I hope to satisfy this amiable audience that my chemical process is equally perfect in this respect. It furnishes us with an elixir of the following nature.

“By its very first commandment, the moral code of Christianity obliges me to believe all the absurdities comprised in its dogma: impossible! It obliges me to forgive my enemies, and love them as myself: impossible! It obliges me to sacrifice the dearest, the strongest inclinations of my nature: impossible! It obliges me to confess my sins, however shameful, however secret, to a man like myself: impossible! It obliges me to practise virtues which degrade a man; humility, which makes him a poltroon; detachment, which makes him a bad citizen; the flight of the world, which makes him a misanthrope; the constant fear of hell, which makes him an idiot: impossible! To all this it adds a long list of practices, observances, privations, which bind a man hand and foot: impossible! In one word, the moral code of Christianity bears no proportion to human weakness; that it should have come from a God infinitely wise and good is impossible. It is therefore false and tyrannical, — absurd!

“What have you to say, Gentlemen Chemists of the Imperial and Royal Academies of Paris, London, Vienna, Petersburg, and Pekin? Can you hope to arrive at results more complete, when you try by analysis to discover the component elements of bodies? You may hang yourself for spite, illustrious Orfila! never, even with Marsh’s apparatus, will you be able to detect in a dead dog the arsenical parts half so completely as Doctor Evariste culls out, by his peculiar process, the last and most minute atom of the black serpent’s venom. Deny it who can: I hold here in my receiver the whole *essential acid* of all the objections, past, present, or future, that can be made against the moral code of Christianity. I conclude, therefore: **MORALITY OF CHRISTIANITY, TOTAL IMPOSSIBILITY.** And there’s a second point settled.

“I terminate the whole process, Gentlemen and Ladies, by the objections against Catholic worship, and I obtain the salt which you are now going to see. The worship of Christianity is a heap of vain and ridiculous superstitions, fit only for old women and children at the most. Pour a few drops of water on the head of an infant, with certain words, and he is cleansed from sin, — made white as snow:

superstition! Rub his forehead with oil, and he becomes strong enough to vanquish the most formidable enemies: superstition! He takes a piece of bread over which the priest has pronounced a few words, and it is no longer bread, — it is God in person: superstition! Is he sick? Anoint the organs of his senses, and his sins are forgiven him: superstition! And, then, all these genuflexions, these ceremonies which have neither rhyme nor reason, — a real puppet-show that sets a fool staring, but excites pity in a sensible man, — what is all this but superstition, eternal superstition? And yet this is the whole form and substance of Catholic worship.

“I appeal to this honorable society, whether I have mitigated in any manner the venom of the black serpent, and whether, by my chemical operation, it has not even acquired a more intense degree of malignity. I say, therefore: **WORSHIP OF CHRISTIANITY, TOTAL SUPERSTITION.** And there’s the third point settled.

“Gentlemen and Ladies, this is all; for Christianity is attackable only on these three points. Remember, now, what you have heard. All the objections which infidelity can possibly make, when ground up and distilled, give for result a composition fully expressed by these three terms, which have become technical: **ABSURDITY, IMPOSSIBILITY, SUPERSTITION.** Absurdity in the dogma; impossibility in the morality, superstition in the worship; here is the honorable label of Christianity.

“This is the compound of my admirable specific, which I divide into pills numbered 1, 2, 3, &c., as high as seven. The composition of this incomparable salve is therefore simple and easy, but at the same time in strict accordance with all chemical and pharmaceutical rules.

“VI. APPLICATION OF THE SALVE TO ENCEPHALIC WOUNDS. — PREPARATIVE MEASURES.

“Gentlemen and Ladies, the father of the medical art, the great Hippocrates, in his *Aphorisms*, recommends to all Doctors to approach their patients as a candidate for election does the voters of his district: with head uncovered, brow serene, sweet and caressing forms of speech, and a smile on the lips, if possible. I do my best to follow this fundamental precept of the art. Do I meet with a victim of the black serpent? I manifest the greatest interest in him, and give signs of deep sympathy. I am perfectly accommodating, and suffer him to spit out whatever he may have in his throat, or elsewhere.

“But I cannot better instruct you, Gentlemen and Ladies, in the true method of applying this precious salve, than by relating to you exactly my own treatment of an illustrious patient, whose case

is recent. For, as the Roman orator says, *Fabricando fit faber*; or, as the Mantuan swan has sung, *Ab uno disce omnes*; which implies, Ladies, *If you can work one slipper, you can work a thousand.*

“To proceed; on my return from my last voyage to Rio de la Plata, in South America, I landed at Bordeaux, on the Garonne; travelling thence to Paris, I stopped at Tours, in Touraine. I put up at the house of a friend, who informed me, with great consternation, that the most celebrated lawyer of the place had been bitten in the head by the black serpent. ‘He has since bitten several others,’ said my friend; ‘and these, others still; so that the viperian contagion is likely to spread far and wide; and unless you come to our aid, Doctor, we are lost.’

“*We are lost!* What an impressive word, Gentlemen and Ladies, when spoken to the ear of a doctor! It was hardly uttered when I was up and doing. In twenty-two minutes and four seconds, I had visited the mayor at his office, and had announced in every part of the town, that a public meeting would be held that very evening, with permission of the constituted authorities, at which I would cure gratuitously, radically, instantaneously, and without pain, all encephalic wounds of the black serpent. The name of Doctor Evariste de Gypendole was soon in every mouth.

“When the assembly was convened, I drew near to my patient, who was seated in an arm-chair, taking care to follow exactly the rule of Hippocrates before quoted. At my approach, he manifested a slight convulsive motion, followed immediately by an inclination to expectorate. I encouraged him to it; and suddenly his lips flying open with the reverse of a steel-trap action, he flung this discharge full in my face: ‘Yes, Sir, the dogma of Christianity is absurdity, three fourths at least!’

“This eructation, near as I stood, did not, however, disturb me or make me shrink; — I have undergone many of the kind. On the contrary, I stepped a little nearer, and, holding this small box under the patient’s nose, I made him inhale the perfume of my pills, saying, at the same time, ‘Most excellent Sir, you are too moderate by far; say rather that the dogma of Christianity is a total absurdity, total as the eclipse of the moon on the 29th day of July, 1830. I grant you all.’ Thereupon I felt his pulse, with a smile.

“An inclination to expectorate was again manifested, and he threw at my feet a new discharge: ‘Yes, Sir, the morality of Christianity is an impossibility, a system of tyranny in most points.’

“I presented again my fragrant box to the olfactory nerves of the patient, accompanying the application with these words, in a caressing tone: ‘Speak out freely; say it is such in *every* point; granted, granted.’ I felt his pulse again; it was more regular; the muscles of his face relaxed, and he half opened his eyes to look

at me. It is evident that he has confidence in his physician, the man is saved. The cure is already commenced. A last expectoration, occasioned by the simple odor of my salve, brought forth another discharge: 'Yes, Sir, the worship of Christianity is full of superstitions, idle, degrading, and immoral.'

"For the third time, I made him inhale the perfume of my wonderful box: 'Friend of my heart, speak out, speak out; don't say it's full, say it's superstition itself. Yes, from the Mass to the holy-water pot, all is superstition in Catholic worship, absolutely all; granted again; there's no exception.'

"This third concession, Gentlemen and Ladies, is an antispasmodic of the greatest efficacy. My patient rolled his eyes round twice; the students of the Chinese University could not have done it so well; he brought the muscles of the upper and lower lids to their full stretch, passed his hand over his forehead, and became gentle as a lamb, mild as might be a woman without a tongue. Fixing his eyes wide open upon me, the illustrious lawyer congratulated me on the progress of my reason; then, drawing off his glove, which was of the color of fresh butter, and stretching forth his hand, 'Take this,' said he; 'Doctor, we are friends; you belong to us; I shall at once inscribe your name on the honorable catalogue of philosophy.' 'Wait a moment,' I replied, with much modesty; 'an honor so extraordinary should be purchased, methinks, at a higher price; I have one to offer; please inform me if it be agreeable.'

"Then, to the astonishment of the distinguished assembly, I applied to the very root of his nose my pill No. 1, in the following manner. 'I have already granted you three assertions; I must yet add a fourth concession. I will admit all the objections of all the philosophers, heretics, miscreants, whether past, present, future, old or new; I pile them up, if you choose, one upon another; they form a mountain eighteen hundred times higher than the tops of Himalaya, or the peak of Chimborazo; or, in other words, Christianity, in its dogma, its morality, its worship, from head to foot, and from beginning to end, is an absurdity eighteen hundred times bigger than the highest known mountains of the earth. I can do no more; but is this enough?'

"'Who could ask more of you, Doctor? You outstrip our most illustrious ancestors, from Celsus and Porphyry, down to Voltaire and his brilliant progeny of Jansenists, Eclectics, Idealists, Materialists, Saint-Simonians, Fourierists, Universitarians, Pantheists, and Humanitarians. I hardly know one of those honorable and learned philosophers who has not recognized in Christianity at least some small fragment of truth and goodness; were it only the belief in hell to punish their gainsayers, or the obligation for others to respect their small but honestly acquired fortune. But you, Doctor, bursting nobly the trammels of these still lurking prejudices, you recognize no more truth in its dogma than in the charter

of Berard; no more virtue in its morality than pure copper in the coin of Monaco. Total absurdity, — this is your last conclusion; you give over Christianity, bound hand and foot, to the power of Philosophy. Your generosity is unequalled; decidedly, I must inscribe you at once.'

" 'You are kind enough, then, Master, to give me the credit of having raised the objections against Christianity to their highest power?' 'I tell you again, it is impossible to do better.' 'I must confess, however,' said I, 'it would be an usurpation on my part to claim for myself the honor of the invention. You know that these objections, with all their strength, were raised against Christianity from the first day of her birth.' 'I am aware of it: whoever has read the works of our first ancestors must know, that in the fourth century whatever could be said had been said already. Since then, we have only warmed things over again. But the merit which I admire in you is, that you have reduced our whole doctrine to its most simple expression, and extracted its very quintessence. Come, come, Doctor, enough of your modesty; your names and titles, if you please.' And he drew his pencil to enlist me.

" 'Seeing my illustrious patient so well prepared, I took delicately my pill No. 2, between my thumb and forefinger, with a tone of timidity and humble respect, 'Master,' said I, 'before I am invested with this immortal honor, I have one little difficulty to be removed, — one small, trifling, little difficulty. I shall presume to ask you for the solution. Here it is: HOW DO YOU EXPLAIN THE FAITH OF THE UNIVERSE?'

" *Hoc opus, hic labor*, this was *the asses' bridge*, as Scarron translates. 'I don't understand you exactly,' was his answer. 'I will repeat, then. Eighteen hundred years ago, the world was pagan; to-day, it is Christian. How do you explain the faith of the universe?' 'Express your thoughts more clearly.' 'Most willingly,' I replied, and, taking my pill No. 3, I made him swallow in this manner.

" 'We agree that Christianity is a mountain of absurdities, of impossibilities, and of superstitions. Yet it has been received and believed by the universe.

" 'It has been believed on the word of twelve fishermen, without science, without money, without influence.

" 'It has been believed in the age of Augustus, which was undeniably and eminently the age of philosophy and of light.

" 'It has been believed in spite of the hundred warning voices of our ancestors, who cried out incessantly, as we do now, that it was absurdity all over.

" 'It has been believed in spite of the mockery of comedians, who brought its mysteries upon the stage, and held them up to universal derision.

“ ‘It has been believed, which is still more astonishing, in spite of Nero, Domitian, Diocletian, and their fellows; and the manner in which they treated refractories, as you are aware, was by no means a joke.

“ ‘It has been believed in spite of all the light of reason and all the repugnance of nature.

“ ‘And all this, Master, is but a trifle yet. There is something still more inexplicable; something that surpasses all the feats that I have ever witnessed at Nicolet’s or Franconi’s, Carter’s or Van Amburg’s. For the sake of believing an absurdity big as a mountain, for the sake of practising a morality which is impossible, for the sake of professing a worship which is ridiculous, the universe without flinching gave up its fortune to confiscation, abandoned with joy its head to the fangs of lions and the claws of bears, its body to the chains of torturers, or to the fires that gleamed around the stake.

“ ‘And, moreover (I beseech you, Master, help me out of this difficulty, or I shall lose my footing), and, moreover, Christianity has effected this at every point of the globe; at Jerusalem, at Athens, at Rome, as often as you could wish. It was not the common people alone; it was consuls, and senators, and philosophers; it was generals, and colonels, and veteran soldiers; it was noble dames, and rich gentlemen; it was men of all ages and all classes, from the highest to the lowest. I must confess, Master, I have never been able to explain to my *perfect* satisfaction so strange a delirium. Can you do it for me?’

“ ‘The silence with which he honored my discourse, the slight carmine tinge which began to light up his cheek, gave me the assurance that my pill was operating powerfully. The respectable audience meanwhile fulfilled to the letter the beautiful verse of Virgil, —

‘Conticuere omnes intentique ora tenebant’;

that is to say, Ladies, *there was no coughing, spitting, blowing of noses, chatting, or whispering*; you might have heard a pin drop. I took advantage of this profound silence to continue the administration of my remedy.

“ ‘Whilst you are thinking over the difficulty, Master, allow me to suggest a solution which has struck me as not void of probability. I am inclined to believe that the Apostles were British smugglers, who contrived to set the whole world a chewing opium for three hundred and fifteen years. Stupefied by this practice, the poor fools must have said, done, and endured whatever was required of them. The solution appears probable to me for several reasons: —
1 The Apostles were Jews by origin. 2. The Jews have always shown a natural inclination for commercial pursuits. 3. The emperors of those days held the Apostles in pretty much the same light the present emperor of China does the English; they called

them, not unfrequently, poisoners and corrupters. This, Master, is the trifling difficulty that annoys me somewhat, and the explanation which I have hit upon with the little philosophical light I possess.'

"My illustrious patient turned his head aside, presenting to me in full profile his nose and jaw-bone; then, raising his hand, began to scratch gently behind his right ear; a very simple movement, Gentlemen and Ladies, but picturesque, and strongly symptomatic. His answer was given with a serious catonicoplatic air. 'I perceive that there is a little difficulty here; as for the solution you give, it's new. What a pity that I have not at my disposal the telescope of our venerable Dupuis, with which he was enabled to discover Jesus Christ and the twelve Apostles in the signs of the zodiac. Like as not, we should spy out in the moon the vast plains whence those smugglers of Galilee got the opium with which they bedevilled the human race for so many years. My particular friend, Herschell the younger, can no doubt furnish me with the means of verifying this solution; till then, we must needs hunt up another.'

"'Master, if it be not too much presumption, allow me to submit another to your judgment. Right or wrong, I must be a philosopher. A philosopher! What a noble title! And to you, most excellent Sir, will belong the honor of having added the last gem to the crown of Doctor Evariste. I have, then, another solution to offer. I do it with great diffidence; for, between you and me, I first heard it from an old woman. However, a fool may sometimes give good advice.'

"Having thus excited a wholesome appetite in my patient, I extracted slyly from my box pill No. 4, and, rubbing him with it adroitly on the prominence of the *os frontis*, I went on:—

"'Here is what I once heard from an old Catholic woman of the old Catholic stamp; I shall translate for you, as well as I am able, her *patois* of Provence. "The mysteries of Christianity are impenetrable to human reason: true. If you try to measure their depth, your head will soon whirl: true. The morality of the Christian religion is above the strength of human nature: true. Its worship, made up of forms, rites, ceremonies, is nothing but a muss: true, very true; I see all that. We old women can understand that two and two make four, and that Christianity at the beginning must have caused a great hue and cry; that it must have passed amongst men for a folly, a scandal, an absurdity as total as the eclipse of last year. But, as I was saying the other day to my neighbour, Mrs. Jones, mankind, that is to say, fine ladies and gentlemen, learned and ignorant, old and young, rich and poor, have believed and do believe Christianity to be true as the Gospel. They saw in it nothing but a muss, a hodge-podge, sure enough. But, marry, *the miracles of our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles*

forced them to believe in it. And, as our parish priest was saying the other day, it is not easy to hold out against a discourse that begins and ends with a miracle. Men saw miracles, therefore, and thousands of them. And that is the reason why they have believed and still do believe."

"After this speech the old woman dropped a courtesy, and was off.' . . . 'Good riddance to her,' said the lawyer, impatiently. 'What nonsense! Could n't the old fool see that there were no more miracles in favor of Christianity than in favor of any thing else? Are not the laws of nature immutable?'

"With an agreeable smile and honeyed lips, I replied: 'Be calm, Master, be calm; I proposed the explanation with much diffidence, and only to satisfy you.' Then, taking hold of his hand, feeling his pulse: 'So, no miracles; you stick there, do you?' 'Are you a fool, Doctor?' said he, angrily; 'if you admit miracles in the establishment of Christianity, you must bid good bye to philosophy, and turn old woman or Roman Catholic outright.'

"Gentlemen and Ladies,' said I, in a loud voice, to the assembly, 'the question is settled. Mankind, upon the word of twelve idiots, and without miracle, received and believed firmly a religion which is equally absurd, impossible, and ridiculous.'

"Well, that's a good one,' cried out a young proletary at the extremity of the hall; 'and I defy the most capacious known throat in the world, to wit, Mr. Frederic Budget's, to swallow it. But the Doctor has left out the best of it. Mankind, to accommodate this mountain of absurdities in its head, has consented to be whipped, racked, drawn and quartered, strangled, roasted, and ground into minced meat. That is a good one!'

"The impertinent young man then burst into a fit of laughter which threatened to become contagious. I restored order and silence by informing the audience that the express object of my journey to Paris was to ask of the Royal Academy of Medicine an explanation of the phenomenon. At the same time, I asked their permission to relate a marvellous instance of my last journey in Italy.

"VII. SALVE APPLIED TO ENCEPHALIC WOUNDS. — PROGRESS OF THE OPERATION.

"As the skilful dentist amuses his patient with a story, and in the midst suddenly jerks out the decayed tooth; so did I proceed with mine. Edging up my seat close to his arm-chair, and applying one half of pill No. 5 to the vertex, just at the root of the forelock, I began: —

"Returning from Alexandria, I was travelling by Milan, Bologna, and Modena. My route lay through the rich fields of Lombardy and Parma, famous for the victories of the great Napo-

leon. My vehicle was a calash, English built, new, brilliant, and light as a feather. Four large Andalusian horses, swift as deer, strong as lions, were at the pole; I had two Norman postilions, hair-brained fellows as ever I saw, but real Phaëtons. The weather was beautiful, the road smooth as a billiard-table or a polished Venetian mirror. I had neither trunk nor baggage of any kind; my own individuality was the whole load. You may imagine, I did n't run, I flew along the road. — Natural enough, was it not, Master? — Surely no equipage could be in better trim for rapid travelling.

“But, alas! as the poet sings, *Sunt bona mixta malis*; every rose has its thorns. Just as I was passing the edge of a wood, eighteen robbers sprung out upon us and began by breaking all the wheels of my carriage. Can you believe the fact, when I tell you, upon the faith of Doctor Evariste de Gypendole, — I have seen it, yes, seen with my own eyes, — my carriage ran as fast as ever? — “Oh! Ah!” cried I, like the sworn appraiser of the Hotel Bouillon at Paris, “miracle one!”

“They unhitched my horses and killed my postilions. The speed of my carriage was not diminished. “Oh! Ah! miracle two!”

“The rascals had dug deep trenches across the road. No matter, on went the carriage, as fast as ever. “Oh! Ah! miracle three!”

“They had blocked up the road with immense fragments of rock. On went the carriage, as fast as ever. “Oh! Ah! ’t is like the circus seats, from wonderful to more wonderful. — Miracle four!”

“They piled over me enormous bales, and my carriage, light as a tilbury before, was heavy as a Neapolitan wagon for fifteen horses. Still on it goes as fast as ever. “Incredible! impossible!” said I. “God or the devil must be at work here! There’s nothing but miracles, that’s certain.”

“What do you think, Master? did I reason correctly?” “Very correctly, Doctor. The facts once established, I should say with you, God or the devil must have had a hand in it.” He accompanied this answer with a patronizing smile, such as the ministerial bureaucrats sometimes deign to bestow on the old nobility.

“I seized this happy moment to anoint his right temple with the remaining half of the emollient pill No. 5.

“Excellent Sir,” said I, in imitation of the Eastern sages, ‘I have spoken in parables. In vulgar language, my superb carriage, new, light, and in perfect order, is Christianity itself, formed by the hand of God; my fiery steeds are its miracles; my postilions, its Apostles; my fine road is the happy disposition of hearts and minds humble and docile to the voice of God. The carriage advancing with such rapidity is Christianity, which, notwithstanding the in-

comprehensibility of its dogma, and the severity of its morality, notwithstanding the objections of philosophers, and the scaffolds, the burning piles, the racks of persecution, notwithstanding the horrible repugnance of human nature, and every possible obstacle, spread in a moment from east to west. And the human race cried out, with a voice like an eagle-scream, "Miracle! miracle!" For we are weak enough to believe, Master, — mankind and I, — that God was at work, and seriously, too, in this matter. Never, no never, could Peter, Paul, and company have converted, otherwise, even one old woman. And they did convert the world! I can't endure myself for being subject to such a weakness; for it deprives me of the great honor of being counted amongst the philosophers, and stuffs me with Christian faith enough for two like me. To complete my misfortune, you have increased the evil instead of curing it. It's too bad of you; if you go on at this rate, you'll give me faith enough for four. . . . Yes, Master, to my sorrow I must say it, you are in a fair way of building up between philosophy and me a wall as high as the great wall of China.' 'You wrong me, Doctor; I have told you, and tell you again, in the establishment of Christianity there is no more miracle than in the palm of my hand.' 'That's just what drives me to despair.' 'Why, if there's no miracle, who can force you to believe?' 'You, Master.' 'I?' 'Yes, you; you pretend to deny all miracles, and at the same time you multiply them beyond all bounds. Instead of clearing up, charitably, my little difficulty, you have made it a thousand times more inexplicable, and the faith of the universe a thousand times more miraculous.' 'How so?'

"'You remember my adventure in Italy, my calash, horses, postilions, and the rest?' 'Certainly.' 'By denying miracles, don't you see what you are doing?' 'An act perfectly philosophical.' 'Pardon me, not quite.' 'Why not?' 'Will you allow me to tell you?' 'By all means, Doctor.' 'Well, then, it's painful for me to say so, but I must declare you are worse than Mrs. Jones, and all the old women of Christendom.' 'That's strange enough.' 'Alas! but it is so; your act is superlatively Catholic.' 'You're an odd man, Doctor.' 'But you are more so, and cruel to boot. By denying miracles, you smash every wheel of the Christian chariot; yet it runs over the world, nobody knows the fact better than you, and runs with the rapidity of lightning. And I must cry out, even louder than in the plains of Lombardy and Parma, "Oh! ah! miracle! miracle!" And you, Master, are the very man who draws from me this anti-philosophic cry. It is you, who, by the creation of this unheard-of miracle, this chariot running without wheels, increase my admiration, and destroy in my heart the sprouting germ of dear infidelity, and make me a Christian strong as four put together. Is this what I am to expect from you, Master, — I who am so willing to become the candid and simple child of philosophy?'

"The illustrious lawyer opened his eyes, ears, and mouth full stretch, and looked for all the world like a rascally debtor who pretends not to understand a man who duns him in plain terms, and holds up his note of hand to his very nose.

"I went on with my elegy: 'You have carried even further your perfidious stratagem. After the example of your predecessors, Celsus, Porphyry, Voltaire, Rousseau, and Volney, you have changed the Apostles into myths, allegories, imaginary beings, signs of the zodiac; or, at the most, they were, according to you, but beggars, barefooted vagrants, fanatics, and jugglers, detestable in the sight of Heaven, that curses imposture, and of earth, that holds it in abhorrence. What have you done? You have unhitched the horses, you have killed the postilions; you have created a wonder tall as the pyramids of Egypt, — a chariot that runs not only without wheels, but without horse or postilion. I am forced to cry out, louder and louder, "Oh! ah! miracle! miracle!" My astonishment swells more and more, and you give me Christian faith for ten. Thus, after having extended to my very lips the delicious cup of infidelity, suddenly you draw it back again, and leave me to suffer the torments of Tantalus.'

"At this stage of the exhibition, a feeling of surprise began to spread through the audience, and I heard a low whispering circulate amongst them. My illustrious patient enjoyed the privilege of the prisoner at the bar in a court of justice, — that of being the object of universal curiosity, and the centre of attraction for all eyes.

"I went on in a plaintive tone: 'As if the sore blows you have dealt already were not enough to crush within me the precious germ of impiety, you still pound at it with a fury that the Grand Inquisitor Torquemada might take for a model. In the dogma of Christianity I perceived only mysteries that humbled reason, and you have pointed out to me absurdities that annihilate it. Already I was at a loss to account, without some miracle, for the faith of the universe in mysteries so incomprehensible: how much more necessary will that miracle be to explain its faith in perfect absurdities! If a man of sense, to believe common mysteries, so as to let his throat be cut in their defence, must have, say, one hundred miracles of twenty carats each, we may calculate, that, to believe palpable absurdities, to have them stuck fast, nailed and clinched, in his head and heart, he must have at least one million of miracles thirty carats each; and I doubt whether that would be enough, if the man happens to be the whole human race. Now the dogma of Christianity, you say, is a total absurdity, — absurdity first quality, fast colors, the tomahawk of genius, and extinguisher of the light of reason.' 'I say so still,' muttered the lawyer. 'Pon honor, this is too bad; you'll not stop as long as a single stone of my philosophical edifice is left standing. You have already broken the wheels of the chariot,

unhitched the horses, killed the postilions, and now you begin to dig trenches in the road, and yet on goes the chariot faster than ever. I must cry, I must shout, louder than in Italy, "Oh! Ah! miracle! miracle!" And it is you, Master, who fill my throat with this cry, the death-knell of my youthful incredulity; you who invent the incomparable miracle of a chariot that runs, that flies, without wheels, horses, or driver, over a road cut up by pits and ditches. In spite of myself, my faith grows to the strength of a giant, my admiration overflows, and you make me as Catholic as the Pope of Rome himself. *Tu quoque, Brute!* cried Cæsar, when he saw Brutus amongst his assassins. And you too, Master, you side with the apologists of Christianity! fiercer than all the rest, you pierce to the heart your wretched disciple! *Tu quoque, Brute!*

"These last words I pronounced with so much emotion, and in a manner so perfectly dramatic, that the Professor of Geometry of the Royal College was moved to tears.

"Seeing my patient more calm, I continued in the same sad and reproachful tone: 'Yes, Master, with a vigor of logic that would do honor to a better cause, you drive my poor philosophy to its last intrenchment; and I see clearly, you will grant neither truce nor quarter, until you exterminate it in my heart. The moral code of Christianity, to believe you, is tyranny, is an iron yoke, an impossibility, and its worship a bundle of superstitions. Nothing more was wanting to constitute the most astonishing of miracles. You have broken the wheels of the chariot, untackled the horses, killed the drivers, and cut up the roads; but this was not enough; you now pile up mountains of rock in the way, and heap on the vehicle enormous loads, — enough to make it eighteen hundred times heavier than the constitutional car of state. And in spite of all these obstacles, in spite of all these reasons for *not* going, the chariot goes still, and runs, and flies. And I am left to roar till I'm hoarse, ten thousand times louder than in Italy, "Oh! ah! miracle without measure! miracle! miracle without end! I no longer believe; I see.'" And instead of making a philosopher of me, you make me a Christian ready to have my throat cut for it. Is it thus that you instruct youth? Is it thus that you repay my confidence, and clear up my little difficulty? Sorrowful, disheartened, pushed back for ever from the smiling regions of blessed philosophy, what other honest way have I now left to explain the faith of the universe, which you have made a thousand times more inexplicable, and a thousand times more miraculous, than all Catholicity put together could have done? What means have I left but to say: "It is prodigiously incredible; therefore either prodigiously diabolical or prodigiously divine?"

"Alas! vain hope! Were I to say, for the sake of dodging the obligation of becoming, body and soul, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman, that the devil worked prodigiously to establish Christiani-

ty, men would laugh in my face. For none but a fool would cut a stick for his own back, or buy a halter to stretch his own neck. Now we must give the devil his due: he may have a cloven foot and horns like a he-goat; but he is no fool. *Nolens, volens*, I must conclude, the establishment of Christianity is a fact prodigiously incredible, prodigiously impossible. Hence it is clear as two and two make four, that God had prodigiously to do with it; therefore the faith of the universe is prodigiously divine. *Incredibile, ergo divinum. Incredibilissimum, ergo divinissimum.*

“Nor, unfortunately, is this all; you force me to drink the cup to the very dregs. For I am obliged, whether or no, under pain of a mortal sin, — a sin of which Doctor Evariste will never be capable nor guilty, the sin of folly, bad logic, — I am obliged to swallow every drop, and to confess that the doctrines of Catholicity, in dogma, in morality, and in worship, are nothing but pure truth; that the whole concern done up in the envelope of this great miracle must pass through without further question, like a letter through the mail. God can never perform miracles to accredit error.

“Good heavens, what a blunder! Instead of turning out philosopher like yourself, I am driven to be as Catholic as the Pope! What a sad plight you’ve brought me to, Master! For you have yourself put into my mouth this terrible, this fatal *Incredibilissimum, ergo divinissimum*; prodigiously incredible, therefore prodigiously divine. This is the last groan of my expiring infidelity; and, I must say it, you have drawn it forth from my despairing heart.’

“Having pronounced these words, Gentlemen and Ladies, I sunk back in my chair. The laborious administration of my pill No. 5 was at an end. We were all watching the effect in silence. It was feared by some, hoped for by others, guessed at by all; and soon it began to be visible.

“Powerfully worked upon by this mighty antidote, and exhausted by his efforts to expectorate the viperian phlegm, the patient sunk back in his chair, rolled his eyes three times, and began to doze, much like the readers of the young historian of the French Revolution, or the admirers of Lord Guizot.

“This symptom, Gentlemen and Ladies, is very encouraging; it announces the neutralization of the venom, and the commencement of the cure. To hasten this happy effect, — for, I repeat it, my precious salve claims the honor of healing instantaneously, radically, and without pain, all bites whatsoever of the black serpent, — I profited by this lucky nap to apply simultaneously to the occiput and left temple of the illustrious patient my two remaining pills, Nos. 6 and 7. Immediately I drew them forth from this very identical box which you see. But how do you think I did it? Lengthwise or broadwise? Not at all. With a rough and ruthless hand, as the tax-gatherer snatches the last shilling from the purse of the

free citizen? By no means. Such imprudence might have awaked the patient; and it is an axiom of the Roman Hippocrates, the judicious Galen, that *Qui bene dormit non peccat*; or, *Cat that naps does n't scratch*. But, with all the delicacy that is hereditary in an old duchess of Quality Row, when she extracts a pinch of Maccoboy from her gold snuff-box, I drew forth my two pills, and, warming them in the hollow of my hand, applied them with this medico-cabalistic formula: 'By the virtue of my salve, may the encephalic bite of the black serpent make thee the brother of Balaam; for curses mayest thou give blessings, and instead of destroying, mayest thou build!'

"Scarcely was the operation over, when the patient awoke, sneezed twice, rubbed both eyes, and stammered out: 'I believe I see; — no, — yes, — ah! I understand. Doctor, Doctor, now I see it,' said he to me, smiling pleasantly; 'you have been carrying on Indian warfare; your devilish salve is a real trap. I was fully confident, that, with my objections, I could envelope you in the meshes of incredulity, or, at least, that I could amuse the public by giving you and all believers a regular dressing. And I must confess I felt no little pride in performing for the Catholics the honorable functions of a Russian corporal who administers the knout to refractory soldiers.' Then, burying his face in his hands, he was silent a moment; then broke out again like a stock-jobber who has burnt his fingers in a speculation: 'Where the devil were my wits? Why could n't I see what is now plain as day, that I was cutting a stick for my own back, and for the whole tribe of philosophers? Why, the thing is evident; the more striking the objections against Christianity are made, the more inexplicable the faith of the universe will appear; the more clearly we demonstrate that it is a superhuman task to plant it in the human heart and mind, the more solidly we establish the necessity, splendor, power, and number of those miracles which have produced such convictions.'

"The patient scratched behind his ear again, — just what I expected, Gentlemen and Ladies, and, with a tone somewhere between the serious and comic, continued: 'The most singular of the whole affair, Doctor, is, that, in reasoning as I have done, I find myself, as every other philosopher must in the end, stuck fast between the two sharp horns of this dilemma; you wish to explain the faith of the universe; do you admit a miracle or not? Choose whichever side you please. If I say, "Miracle," I'm gone; for, unless I am prepared to commit the ugliest of all mortal sins, the sin which Hippocrates has so sagaciously named the aneurism of fools and the dropsy of poltroons, I must come out, whether or no, as Catholic as the Pope. If I say, "No miracle," I'm gone again worse than ever; for straight the stubborn miracles rise up in myriads, tall as giants; they beset my passage, throttle me, and either strangle rea-

son, or make me cry out twenty times louder than all Christendom together, "Miracle! miracle!"

"Yes, Doctor, your salve is a lure, a real trap. Any old woman that has it in her possession can face fearlessly an army of infidels, and is an apologist as formidable as Tertullian himself. She has only to stick to her spinning-wheel and say *amen* to all their objections; and in a short time she will see the beasts tearing their sides and gnawing their own tails off. Every new objection raises still higher the pedestal of her faith.

"'Doctor, you've played me a pretty trick. By Jove, if ever again, — but no matter; I can forgive you, and I know how to look for revenge.'

"Then, pressing my hand affectionately, he whispered in my ear, 'To-morrow I'll set the same snare at the door of my office, and the philosophical badgers of the neighbourhood had better look out. The bitten ones that I know of shall get their foot in it. This evening I had to pay the scot; to-morrow will be their turn.

"'Doctor,' he continued, raising his voice to the pitch of a militia officer, 'one hundred boxes of pills, and your bill.'

"'My bill?' said I, 'my bill?' Gentlemen and Ladies, only look at the children of the nineteenth century! They imagine that all the devotedness of the age is reducible to bank-notes. It is a libel upon our times. I appeal to the spotless incorruptibility of our office-holders, public and private; to the sterling good faith of our merchants, high and low; to the proverbial charity of our manufacturers armed with patents and premium medals; to the conscientious modesty of our authors; to the records of our courts; — it is a libel on our times. *Restat adhuc mortalibus usquam intemerata fides.* And were this appeal, by an impossibility, as false as it is true, still my whole life demands an honorable exception in my favor: *Etiam si omnes, ego non.* I have had already the honor of telling you, Gentlemen and Ladies, and I now prove it to you: the Doctor Evariste de Gypendole labors gratuitously for the relief of suffering humanity. 'There is no bill from me, Sir: my reward, as the poet says, is in my own heart: *manet alta mente repostum.*'

"I delivered immediately one hundred boxes of my salve to the illustrious lawyer. And for how much do you think, Gentlemen and Ladies? Learn to admire my disinterestedness. For how much? For two cents a box! Yes, Gentlemen and Ladies, two cents a box! The exact price of the Badajos powders; one half the price of the Venetian theriac; and the precise value, *plus* seven mills, of all the homœopathic-allopathico-eclectic-humanitico-protocolic dregs of all the Esculapiuses that are driving so furiously at the moral cure of the human race."

In the following chapter, the excellent Doctor Evariste proceeds to describe the treatment and cure of a patient who had

been bitten in the heart. We should be glad to follow him, but our limits do not permit us ; and besides, the chapter, to a very considerable extent, is absolutely untranslatable. What we have given will enable our readers to form a tolerable notion of the wit, humor, and, withal, sound logic of the book. We defy all the infidels past, present, and to come, of all grades, shades, and sizes, by whatever name called, or in whatever disguise appearing, to reply to the argument the Doctor urges with such incomparable wit and humor. It is conclusive, and Mrs. Jones' gossip has nothing to do, but stick to her distaff, and say *amen* to all the objections to her Catholic faith all the infidels in the world can bring. The more objectionable you make Christianity, the more repugnant you make it to human nature, the more inexplicable becomes the fact that for eighteen hundred years the most enlightened portion of the world have believed it, and continue to believe it. Here is the fact, which must be explained some way, and which can in no way be explained without a miracle.

We commend the extracts we have made to the serious attention of our Transcendentalists, who appear to be bitten both in heart and head. We beg them to apply faithfully the salve, according to Dr. Evariste's directions ; and if so, our word for it, they will be cured, radically, and without pain.

- ART. III. — 1. *The Relation of Jesus to his Age and the Ages. A Sermon preached at the Thursday Lecture in Boston, December 26, 1844.* By Theodore Parker, Minister of the Second Church in Roxbury. Boston : C. C. Little and James Brown. 1845. 8vo. pp. 18.
2. *The Excellence of Goodness. A Sermon preached in the Church of the Disciples in Boston, January 26, 1845.* By the same. Boston : Benjamin H. Greene. 1845. 8vo. pp. 16.

REV. THEODORE PARKER is, nominally, a Unitarian minister, and is the pastor of the Unitarian congregation in West Roxbury, Massachusetts. He is a man of some pretensions to scholarship, has undoubtedly looked over a great variety of books, and is a very effective rhetorician. At the present

moment, he is, perhaps, one of the most conspicuous figures in our Boston community, and is causing no little excitement and trouble in the bosom of the Unitarian denomination, in consequence of professing to be a Christian teacher, and claiming to be treated as such, while he sneers at what all the world has hitherto deemed sacred, and labors, with untiring zeal and perseverance, to destroy whatever has hitherto been considered essential to the Christian faith and worship.

The trouble and excitement grow out of the fact, that such are the avowed principles of the Unitarian body, that they cannot withdraw or withhold from him their fellowship without condemning themselves. In an evil hour they discarded all doctrinal tests, and laid down the broad principle, that every man professing to be a Christian, if he exhibit what they call the Christian life and character, shall be received and treated as a Christian, whatever the peculiarities of his belief. Mr. Parker, presuming on his life and character, plants himself on this principle, and demands, all infidel as he is, to be treated as an accredited Christian teacher. "I am a Christian," he says, "and I prove it by my life and character; on what grounds, then, do you pretend to withdraw from me that fellowship you once gave me as a Christian minister?"

"On the ground that you deny Christianity, and, under the name of Christianity, teach rank infidelity and foul impiety."

"Who has constituted you judges? It is a principle of the Unitarian denomination, that each member, whether private person or public teacher, has the right, unlicensed and unquestioned, to interpret Christianity for himself. Admit that my interpretations differ from yours, yet by what right do you denounce them as infidel and impious?"

"We denounce them, because they deny Christianity itself, in any and every sense in which the world has hitherto understood it."

"If you say that, you condemn yourselves as well as me; for the appeal to prescription will no more sustain your interpretations than mine."

"Christianity is evidently distinguished from infidelity, and there must be some line of demarkation between it and infidelity."

"And you have drawn it in discarding doctrinal tests, and making one's Christianity to consist in his moral character, saying, with Pope,—

'For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight;
His can't be wrong, whose life is in the right.'

"But no man, whatever his moral character, can be a *Christian*, unless he believes in Jesus, that is, the Divine mission of Jesus."

"Then you eat your own words, deny the sufficiency of character, which you have heretofore asserted, and, contrary to your fundamental principle, introduce a doctrinal test. But I do not deny the Divine mission of Jesus Christ; I admit it."

"Yes, as you do the Divine mission of Plato, or of Theodore Parker."

"I admit it in my sense, and you only admit it in yours; and have not I the same right to interpret Christianity for myself, that you have for yourselves?"

"To *interpret* Christianity, but not to deny it. We complain of you, not for misinterpreting Christianity, but for denying it, and leaving no Christianity to interpret, or even to misinterpret."

"But, before it can be determined whether one does or does not deny Christianity, it must be determined what is Christianity. I have the right to determine for myself what it is. Therefore, unless I deny what I determine it to be, you cannot, on your principles, accuse me of denying it."

"Words have a fixed and determinate sense. If you deny whatever is understood by the word *Christian*, in its authorized sense, you deny Christianity."

"Authorized! by whom or by what? The Catholic Church? Then you are condemned; for you are as far as I am from using the word *Christian* in the Catholic sense. By general usage, that is, tradition? Then, also, are you condemned; for you, as well as I, reject Christianity in its traditional sense. And how long is it since Unitarians admitted the authority of tradition or general usage in theological matters? Admit this authority, and you must abandon all you have contended for, and make your peace with Holy Church as soon as possible."

"We admit this authority, not in settling theological matters, but simply in settling the proper use of theological terms."

"A distinction without a difference. If you accept this authority in settling the meaning of the word *Christian*, you accept it in settling all that you are to understand by Christianity; for all included in the word *Christianity* must be covered by the word *Christian*. To appeal to tradition or general

usage to settle the meaning of words is the same as appealing to it to settle faith itself. You and I agree in rejecting all traditionary authority, and in asserting the unrestricted right of private judgment. Then there can be, for us, no authority for settling the meaning of terms but private judgment, any more than for settling articles of faith."

"But were we to admit this, every thing would be unsettled; no two men could talk intelligibly together for a single moment; there would be no standard, no test, for any thing. All reasoning would be at an end; for no one could convince or refute another, since one might be using the same word in one sense, and the other in a totally different sense. All science, morality, jurisprudence would be out of the question, and even social intercourse would cease, and man become solitary, for want of a medium of communication with his brother."

"Perhaps so: but this is a consequence which you must accept as well as I, unless you choose to abandon the right of private judgment. Private judgment means something or nothing. If it means nothing, let us talk no more about it. If it means something, if it means any thing, it means that the individual is his own judge of truth in all cases whatsoever. If you assert it in face of the Church, you must assert it also in face of the State, of moral codes, and even of science. It is the assertion of the supremacy of man, and the annihilation of all conventionalisms. If you recoil from this conclusion, blush to call yourselves *liberal* Christians, confess and abjure your heresies, and return forthwith to Mother Church. For my part, I plant myself on the indefeasible right of each man to judge for himself, and to follow his own private convictions of truth and duty, lead they were they may."

"Nobody wishes to prevent you from following your own convictions of truth and duty; nor do we deny that you may be a Christian. We do not refuse to fellowship you as a *Christian*, but simply as a Christian *teacher*; not because you may not in your heart believe Christianity, but because what you teach is not Christianity."

"So you say, but not so say I; and I have the same right to say what I teach is Christianity, that you have to say what you teach is Christianity."

"No man who denies the supernatural mission of Jesus can be a Christian teacher; and you do deny it."

"A doctrinal test again! Do you or do you not discard all doctrinal tests? If not, humbly apologize for all that you have

been saying these last thirty years. If you do, you can no more insist on a doctrinal test in the case of the teacher than of the private Christian. Moreover, if you insist on a doctrinal test, I demand your authority to impose one. You are but men ; your authority is only human authority, and you with one voice deny the right of any human authority to dictate in matters of faith. If you can impose one test, you may another ; one article, you may two, and thus, if you choose, the whole Thirty-nine Articles, or all the decrees of the Council of Trent."

"We have heard all this said time and again; but we want no authority for saying, that a man who in express terms denies a horse to be a horse does deny a horse to be a horse. The thing is evident of itself. The supernatural mission of Jesus is Christianity, the very thing to be admitted, if you admit it at all."

"So you may think ; but suppose I think differently, who is to decide between us, pronounce you right and me wrong ? But you have no right to say what you do; for you and the fathers and doctors of the sect have always maintained the contrary, — that Christianity is not belief of this or that, but life, character."

"Yet these doctors and fathers have all believed in and taught the supernatural mission of Jesus."

"But they never insist on this belief as essential to one's Christianity. And what if they do ? Who gave *them* authority to impose a creed, whether longer or shorter, — to forge chains for the free-born mind ? Am not I also a man ? Stand I not on as high a platform of individual independence as they ? Then, if you appeal to fathers and doctors, remember there are older fathers and doctors than these Unitarians, whose authority is as much against you as against me. If there must be an appeal to fathers and doctors, let us have the elder and more venerable, not the younger and less weighty."

"But it is evident from the Sacred Scriptures, and all the sources from whence information can be collected concerning the subject, that a denial of the supernatural mission of Jesus is a denial of Christianity itself."

"So you say; but is your assertion authority ? You make the assertion only on the authority of your interpretation of the Bible and other historical documents ; and have not I as much right to interpret these as you have ?"

"Yes, but you are bound in morals to interpret them honestly, according to their plain, obvious sense."

“ Who is to decide between us, whether yours or mine are the honest interpretations ? ”

“ If a man, having a tolerable pair of eyes and ordinary human faculties, looking at the sun through an unclouded atmosphere, should maintain that it is square or triangular, we should want no authority to call him dishonest, any more than we should any other manifest liar. Some things are so plain, that no man can deny them without prejudice to his sanity or his honesty. The fact that the supernatural mission of Jesus is essential to Christianity is one of these.”

“ So you say; but, if so, all Unitarian preaching has thus far been false; for its burden has been, life, not belief, is essential; be good and do good, and God will never ask you what you have believed.”

“ You misinterpret us. Unitarians are *Christians*, *Christian believers*, and have never taught, or intended to teach, that belief in Christianity is not essential to one’s Christian character. They have insisted that all should believe Christianity; but not that it was necessary that any one should believe this or that particular explication of it.”

“ Eliminate all the particular explications, or expositions, of Christianity, and what will you have left ? ”

“ Christianity.”

“ And Christianity in general, meaning nothing in particular! Just as if a man could even form a conception of Christianity in general, save through conception of it in particular! We learn the general in the particular. Abstract from matter all its properties, and what will be your conception of what remains ? ”

“ We have no disposition to follow you in a metaphysical discussion, for which you yourself have no remarkable aptitude. What we mean to say is, that there are certain bounds, beyond which one cannot pass and remain within the pale of Christianity. Within these bounds we recognize the unrestricted right of private interpretation, but not beyond.”

“ This, in principle, is all the Catholic Church herself says. She merely prescribes certain bounds, that is, certain articles of faith, which she holds essential to the integrity of the Christian faith; within these she also recognizes the fullest individual liberty. You are free to interpret as you will, so long as you advance nothing which is *contra fidem*; and you yourselves say no more than this. But where, on your principles, is the authority that prescribes the bounds beyond which one cannot pass without passing out of Christianity ? ”

" They are prescribed by Christianity itself."

" But what is Christianity? By what authority is this question answered? "

" By the Bible."

" True; but the Bible as construed by the private reason of each interpreter."

" The Bible is so plain, so unequivocal, that no man who respects its authority can possibly mistake the point where Christianity ends and infidelity begins."

" So you say. If you give to the language of the Bible its traditional sense, I agree with you; but that sense condemns you. If you give to the Bible the sense each chooses to give for himself, then I disagree with you; for then the sense of the *language* of the Bible is indeterminate, and can be only what each determines it to be for himself."

" But you deny the Bible itself."

" I do no such thing. I hold it to be the greatest of books. I may deny it in your sense; but I admit it in mine, and you admit it only in yours."

" Yet you deny its inspiration."

" Not at all. It is the product of the purest, deepest, loftiest inspirations ever experienced by the human soul."

" But you deny its *Divine* inspiration."

" I do not. I believe it Divinely inspired. All that is true, pure, deep, and noble in human life is from God. God speaks in every true thought, in every pure affection, in every lofty aspiration, in every noble deed."

" Very fine, and answers admirably the purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of the simple and ignorant. Yet you deny the *supernatural* inspiration of the Bible."

" That depends on the sense in which you use the word *supernatural*. If you mean by it that God himself inspired the authors of the Bible, I agree with you. If you mean something else, I cannot answer, till I know what you do mean."

" But you do not hold that they were *infallibly* inspired."

" Nor do you; for you have written books not a few to prove that the sacred writers could and did err."

" But you deny the *authority* of the sacred writers."

" When they err, but not when they tell the truth; and what more can you yourselves say? "

" You deny the miracles."

" And so do you, in part at least; and you might as well deny those you retain as those you reject. Moreover, mira-

cles are not Christianity; at most, they are only a branch of its evidence. And what difference can it make, whether one believes it on the authority of miracles, or on some other kind of evidence ? ”

“ If you deny the miracles, you have no sufficient evidence for believing it.”

“ Appropriate enough in the mouth of a Catholic contending for mysteries, but strangely misplaced in the mouth of a Unitarian, who professes to believe that Christianity is reasonable and rational ! The doctrine is its own evidence ; and the rule is, to conclude from the truth of the doctrine to its Divine origin, and not the reverse.”

“ You reject the sacraments, and sneer at those who are so weak as to derive strength and comfort from the Lord’s Supper.”

“ You yourselves also reject the sacraments in the sacramental sense ; and the two, of the seven observed by the Church, which you nominally retain, you retain merely as rites or ceremonies. Even you yourselves do not contend that rites or ceremonies are essential to Christianity. In rejecting them, I reject, then, nothing essential, yourselves being judges. As for the sneering, all I have to say is, if any of you are weak enough, superstitious enough, to fancy you can be spiritually strengthened and comforted by the empty ceremony of taking a bit of bread and a sip of wine, you deserve to be sneered at, — at least to be compassionated.”

In our judgment, Mr. Parker has decidedly the advantage in the argument. We do not presume the Unitarians ever intended to lay down principles which should render it impossible to trace the boundary between their doctrines and infidelity. We believe they honestly, as a body, mean to be Christians, and no doubt, in their way, try to be Christians; but in vindicating their own dissent from the general faith of Christendom, they have been forced to lay down principles and adopt a line of argument as available for Theodore Parker as for themselves. They could defend themselves only by discarding all doctrinal tests, that is, all creeds or confessions; and if they discard all doctrinal tests, they cannot withdraw or withhold fellowship from Mr. Parker as a Christian teacher, without standing self-condemned before the world. But they have too much respect for Christianity to fellowship one who so undeniably rejects every thing distinctive, venerable, or valuable in the Gospel.

As low and unworthy as their own views are of our blessed Saviour, they cannot consent to place him in the same category with Zoroaster, Socrates, Mahomet, and Theodore Parker. They are obliged, therefore, to resort to some doctrinal test.

But here is a new difficulty : who has the right to impose a doctrinal test? The Unitarians have very properly denied the right of all human authority to dictate in matters of faith. They have maintained, — and in this they are honorably distinguished from all other Protestant sects, — that God alone has authority over reason and conscience, and that no *human* authority, however constituted, by what name soever designated, has the right to step in between man and his Maker, and demand adherence to this or that creed, to this or that form of worship. In this they have asserted a great principle, which every one who has any just appreciation of Christian liberty must hold fast under all circumstances, and at all hazards. Then either a Divine authority to impose it, or no legitimate doctrinal test. Say any thing else, and you assert the principle of the grossest spiritual tyranny; and it is because Protestants do say something else, and because, all human as their authority confessedly is, they have attempted to control the reason and conscience of their brethren, that they have been from the first, and still are, the most bitter enemies of religious liberty. They have clamored for Christian freedom, we admit, but only the better to cover their designs against it. The devil, when he would deceive, always comes in the guise of an angel of light. Now, what is to be done? Our Unitarians must have a doctrinal test; and yet, as they have confessedly only a human authority, they have no authority to impose one? If they say, Reason is from God, and therefore reason is the authority, they gain nothing; for the test will be what each man in the exercise of his own private reason chooses to make it. If they say, The Bible, it will be no better, so long as they add, the Bible as interpreted by private reason. If they say, The congregation, they get only a human authority; besides, they fall into the gross absurdity of making those to be taught the judges and instructors of the teachers. None of these alternatives will avail them, and they must say, Either no doctrinal test, or a Divinely constituted and commissioned Church to impose it. But they cannot dispense with a doctrinal test, if they mean to keep up any distinction between Christianity and Infidelity. Therefore there must be a Divinely constituted and commissioned Church. But there is no such Church, unless it be the Roman Catholic

Apostolic Church, as we have proved in a preceding article, and as Unitarians themselves will admit. Then they must either fellowship Mr. Parker as a Christian teacher, or return to the bosom of the Catholic Church, whose authority is not her own, but that of God speaking and governing, supernaturally, in and through her.

But, if we believe Mr. Parker has the advantage in the argument with Unitarians, we have no wish to see him sustained, and we have not the least conceivable sympathy with the views and movement he for the moment represents. His doctrines are superficial, unphilosophical, unchristian, false, and pernicious. The fact, that they can find warm admirers and partisans in our professedly Christian community, tells a sad tale for our intelligence, faith, and morals. They are the most damnable doctrines the devil can desire to have propagated. Their prevalence would be ruinous to social order and moral well-being here, as well as to the soul hereafter.

Mr. Parker, as a man, may have some amiable and interesting qualities ; he may have a lively fancy and an excellent memory ; he may have made very respectable literary acquisitions, and be able to write in a style of more than ordinary beauty and effectiveness ; but all this cannot excuse his abuse of God's gifts, and perversion of them to the very worst of causes, or be a valid plea for standing before the public under a false name, and in a character not his own. He knows that he is not, in any received sense of the word, a Christian believer, that he is what all the world understand by an infidel, and yet he would fain palm himself off upon the community as a Christian teacher. We cannot reconcile this with that high moral sense and heroic virtue claimed for him by his friends. He has, moreover, proved himself insensible to the moral obligation every man incurs who puts forth doctrines on his own authority. He has been refuted more than once, both as to his literature and philosophy, his scholarship and his theology, and from sources not unworthy of the respectful consideration of greater and more learned men than he. If half that has been urged against his doctrines in the *Christian Review*, *Christian Examiner*, *Boston Quarterly Review*, and other journals, be well founded, his doctrines are unsupported by a single particle of evidence, and rest only on ignorance of sound philosophy, misstatements of historical facts, misquotations, and false and unwarrantable glosses of the Sacred Scriptures, and other writ-

ings to which he refers. It was his duty, as a professed public teacher, on the appearance of these apparent refutations, either to retract his doctrines, or to show that they might be true in spite of what was alleged against them. He has done neither. He has not proved himself possessed of the humility to retract, nor the courage to reply. We concede the craft of his silence, and that, if his motive be to gather a party around him, silence is unquestionably his wisest and truest policy ; for a lie well stuck to will pass with the multitude unquestioned, and be embraced as God's truth. But the honesty of such craft, the morality of such policy, is worthy of the serious consideration of those who are so loud in claiming Christian fellowship for Mr. Parker on the ground of his life and character. Thus far, moral as he is, he has proved himself void of all sense of moral responsibility as a public teacher, and that he feels himself privileged to bring scandalous charges against the whole Christian world, and when called upon to sustain them, to slink back into the dark, and wait his opportunity to reiterate them. In this he not only refuses to give to them that ask him a reason for the hope he professes to entertain, but disgraces our common manhood, and may well be treated not only as an alien from the commonwealth of Christ, but as an outlaw from the republic of letters.

It is this false position in which Mr. Parker stands before the public, and this cowardly, if not dishonest, policy of continuing to reiterate his doctrines without replying to the grave objections urged against them, that give him his present importance and influence. In his true light, standing forth under his own name, and attempting in a fair and manly way to maintain himself, he would attract no great attention, and gain few partisans. He has, no doubt, very considerable abilities ; he has unquestionably looked over quite a variety of books, and can tell the titles of a great number ; he has, we cheerfully admit, dipped into many subjects, and can talk flippantly on most topics that come up in conversation ; he has a lively fancy, and even some humor ; but he is no miracle ; his scholarship is rarely to be trusted ; his statements, even on indifferent matters, cannot be taken with confidence, unless backed by some authority beside his own ; and as a thinker he is singularly crude, vague, loose, and superficial. He throws no light on any subject he treats, settles no disputed passage in literature, history, criticism, philosophy, or theology, speculative or practical, and he uniformly leaves every subject he touches more confused than

he found it. This even his friends must admit. We have neither time nor patience to go into any general examination of Mr. Parker's doctrines, nor could we, if we had, consent to do so, while he claims the moral right to *ignore* what is said against them, and to continue to repeat, as if nothing had happened, the often refuted falsehood. All that is proper to do, in the case of such a man, is, to strip off his sheep's clothing, and let him stand before the public in his utter nakedness.

Mr. Parker is one of the chiefs of the American Transcendentalists. He may or he may not run into all the vagaries of some well known members of the sect ; but he is a Transcendentalist, and a Transcendental chief. The Transcendentalists are, as is well known, far from agreeing on all points among themselves ; but they all agree in asserting the Divinity of human nature, and that God speaks to us in the instincts or sentiments of our own nature, and not otherwise. They have adopted a very ancient doctrine, and hold what the serpent said to Eve to be the truth. Thus they say, " We are gods, knowing good and evil." At bottom, they are Pantheists, though few of them have the ability or the patience to mould their views into a well defined Pantheism. They profess to be spiritualists, talk much of "the soul," "the noble soul," "the great soul," and "the soul of all." They affect great devoutness, and talk much of pious instincts and pure affections, which, however, are confessedly nothing but natural sentiments, and need but fitting opportunity to become beastly lusts. They have much to say of God, but they deny his personality, his freedom, his providence, and conceive of him, now, as a mighty force pushing itself forth in a world, a man, an elephant, an insect, a moss, — simply because it is force, and must do so, or not be force ; and now, again, they conceive of him as an idea, as man's idea of the Greatest and Best, and varying as vary men's intellectual and moral conceptions, — one thing with the rude savage, another with Plato, another with St. Paul, and still another with Theodore Parker ; — growing always with the growth of humanity, a small affair with the savage, almost as good as no God at all ; but great, grand, magnificent, sublime, with the aforesaid Theodore Parker, and to be even more sublime with the future Theodore Parkers in store for us, and who, one by one, with long intervals between, will arise to bless humanity and transform their age and live through the ages.

Revelation is what man's nature reveals to himself, or what he gathers spontaneously from his own ideas, sentiments, wants,

tendencies, — if this means any thing. It is supernatural, because it does not come from the material world, but from the inward soul ; and divine, because from man's nature, which is itself divine. Each man is God incarnate ; not because there is in each the two natures, but because the human and Divine natures are, at bottom, not two natures, but one and the same nature. The distinction commonly supposed to exist between God and man is merely phenomenal. God is man, and man is God. Who says *I*, meaning thereby a really substantive existence, says God ; and who says God, says *I*. Hence, to know the will of God, we have but to turn our minds in upon ourselves, to follow the example of the Grand Lama of *me* and *not-me*, — of whom Doctor Evariste de Gypendole speaks in the preceding article, — and fix our eyes devoutly upon ourselves, and listen to the oracles from the temple within ourselves, or, to be more exact, within our *inner* self ; for, according to our Transcendentalists, the human soul is best illustrated by an onion, and you do not get at the real self till you have stripped off fold after fold, and come to the innermost of all.

Christianity is accepted ; O, yes, and as divine ; for it is one of the forms with which the human race has sought to clothe its religious sentiment, or in which it has sought to realize its conceptions of the Greatest and Best. By the same title they accept the Fetichism of the African negroes, the Polytheism of the Greeks and Romans, Brahminism, Buddhism, Mahometanism, and all other religions which have been or are. They are all divine, because they are all *human*, — the product of the human race. Of all these, Christianity is to be regarded as the least inadequate. For a time it responded to all the religious wants of the soul, and was, during that time, eminently true, eminently useful. But it has had its day. The human race, in its onward march through the ages, leaves it behind, — casts it off, as the mature man does the garments of his childhood, — and seeks now a new form for its religious sentiment, one more in harmony with its present advanced intelligence, which shall better befit its more mature age and growth.

As for our blessed Saviour, they are, in general, disposed to patronize him. They speak of him as an extraordinary “ Hebrew youth,” a noble soul, a pure and lofty spirit, a bold and earnest reformer, discarding all the conventionalisms of his time, breaking loose from all the existing institutions of Church and State, despising the authority of the popular faith and morality of his age and country, even of Moses and the prophets,

and speaking out, from the depths of his own broad and living nature, great moral truths demanded by, and responding to, man's universal moral and religious sentiments, — in a word, a sort of Theodore Parker of the first century, *minus* Theodore Parker's learning and philosophy.

It were easy to confirm all this by extracts taken at random from the writings of leading Transcendentalists. Take the following from Mr. Parker.

"In an age of corruption, as all ages are, Jesus stood and looked up to God. There was nothing between him and the Father of all: no old world, be it of Moses or Esaias, of a living rabbi or Sanhedrim of rabbis: no sin or perverseness of the finite will. As the result of this virgin purity of soul and perfect obedience, the light of God shone down into the very deeps of his soul, bringing all of the Godhead which flesh can receive. He would have us do the same; worship with nothing between us and God; act, think, feel, live, in perfect obedience to Him: and we never are Christians as he was the *Christ*, until we worship as Jesus did, *with no mediator*, with nothing between us and the Father of all." — *Critical and Miscellaneous Writings*, pp. 161, 162.

"His life [the life of Jesus] is the perpetual rebuke of all times since. It condemns ancient civilization; it condemns modern civilization. Wise men we have since had, and good men; but this *Galilean youth* strode before the world whole thousands of years, — so much of Divinity was in him. . . . In him the Godlike and the Human met and embraced, and a Divine Life was born. Measure him by the world's greatest sons, — how poor they are! Try him by the best of men, — how little and low they appear! . . . But still was he not our brother; the son of man, as we are; *the Son of God like ourselves? His excellence, was it not human excellence?* His wisdom, love, piety, — sweet and celestial as they were, — are they not what we also may attain?" — *Ib.* p. 157.

"Amid all this [Jewish corruption, sin, prejudice, and formalism], and the opposition it raised to a spiritual man, Jesus fell back on the moral and religious sentiments in man; uttered *their* oracles as the Infinite spoke through *them*; taught absolute religion, absolute morality, — nothing less, nothing more; laid down principles as wide as the soul, true and eternal as God." — *Discourse*, pp. 256, 257.

"Jesus looked to God for his truth; his great doctrines not his own, — private, personal, depending on his own idiosyncrasies, and therefore only subjectively true, — but God's, universal, everlasting, the Absolute Religion. I do not know that he did not teach some errors, also, along with it. I care not if he did. It is by his truths that I know him, the absolute religion he taught and lived." — *Relation*, &c., p. 14.

Here the excellence of the character of Jesus is plainly said to be Divine, and formally declared to be human, and attainable by us all: which proves, that, in Mr. Parker's view, the human and Divine are one and the same. The same conclusion is obtained from the account which Mr. Parker gives of the source whence Jesus Christ drew his doctrines. At one time, we are told "he looked up to God alone," "looked to God for his truth"; at another, that "he fell back on the moral and religious sentiments in man." Evidently, in Mr. Parker's view, looking to God and falling back on the moral and religious sentiments in man are one and the same thing. Hence, since man's moral and religious sentiments are integral in man, God and man must be, at bottom, identical. This is still farther evident, from Mr. Parker's assertion, (*Discourse*, p. 280,) that we verify the truth of Christianity in our soul, *because* "the pure water of life must come from the well of God"; which, at least, implies, if not that the soul and God are absolutely identical, "the well of God," that is, the fountain of life, is in the soul and identical with it.

According to Mr. Parker, Jesus drew his doctrines from the moral and religious sentiments of human nature. It was "*their* oracles he uttered," and it was through *them* "the Infinite spoke" to him, revealing to him "absolute religion, absolute morality," "principles wide as the soul, true and eternal as God." This implies that the source whence all truth needed may be drawn is human nature; and no revelation, not made in and through our moral and religious sentiments, is needed. Stripped of its new and gorgeous apparel, what is this but the old Deistical doctrine of the sufficiency of the light of nature? In plain terms, Mr. Parker's doctrine, then, is, Jesus discarded all the pretended supernatural revelations in which his age and country believed, fell back on human nature, consulted his own soul, and declared what he by the simple light of nature discovered, or believed he discovered, to be true. The light of nature was enough for him; it is enough for us. Not a remarkably novel doctrine, and one which the old English Deists have set forth with more ability, sound sense, and blunt honesty of purpose, than we find in the writings of our modern Transcendentalists.

But if nature be sufficient, since we have nature always, how happens it that there is such a contrariety of beliefs in the world, and that such gross and lamentable errors everywhere prevail? If nature be sufficient, it must be sufficient in all and in each.

How explain the fact, then, that it does not preserve all and each from error? If not sufficient to preserve from error, how can it suffice to recover us from error, and sustain us in the truth hereafter? Nature is always the same. Mankind have had it from the first, and all it can give of itself alone,—for it can give only itself,—and yet, according to Mr. Parker himself, they have scarcely gone right for a single moment, in a single particular. What assurance can he give us, if reduced to nature alone, that we shall succeed any better hereafter?

Mr. Parker teaches us that the revelation of truth is the result of virgin purity of soul and perfect obedience. But how, without truth, without the light of God, is this virgin purity of soul, this perfect obedience, to be obtained? Before charity, we had supposed, goes faith; and we know not how there can be faith where the truth has not been propounded to the understanding. “Do the truth and you shall know the truth” is unquestionably true in its proper sense; but we can not do the truth without willing to do it, and to will that which is not intellectually apprehended is impossible. Mr. Parker not unfrequently gets the cart before the horse. His notion is, Jesus was a very good man, and therefore God inspired him. Hence, he infers, if we are only good, God will inspire us in like manner; as if the inspirations of Almighty God, and the revelation of truth, were not necessary as the condition of becoming good!

Mr. Parker denies the necessity of a mediator, and calls upon us to approach the Infinite One face to face. Jesus, he says, looked to God, with nothing between him and the Father of all; so should we. The damning sin of the race is, that they have not done so. “We dare not,” he says, (*Discourse*, p. 5,) “approach the Infinite One face to face; we whine and whimper in our brother’s name, as if we could only appear before the Omnipresent by attorney”; and yet this same man, who talks so flippantly of looking the Infinite in the face, would be sadly puzzled to see his own nose, or the pen with which he writes his blasphemy, without that officious attorney called *light*. Does he mean to assert, that man can, while in the flesh, see God otherwise than as reflected in his works,—that is, his works of creation, providence, and grace? If so, will he give some better proof than his own word of what all the world know to be impudently false? No man has seen God at any time, or can see him and live. Even the heathens, by their fable of Semele, might have taught Mr. Parker as much as that.

Mr. Parker makes it an objection to Christian theology that it promises eternal life as a gift. "Its heaven is a place no man has a right to. Would a good man willingly accept of what is not his? pray for it?" — *Ib.* p. 6. So it belittles a man to receive eternal life as a gift from God! We must earn a right to it by our own stout hearts and strong arms. When did Mr. Parker earn his right to this present life? Does it not belittle him to breathe, since his breath is a gift of God, to which he had, has, and can have no claim of his own?

But these are trifles. Jesus, he tells us, taught absolute religion, absolute morality; and he thinks, and his friends think, that in this he has done great honor to the "Galilean youth," and laid the Christian world under heavy obligations to him for his condescension. Mr. Parker asserts this, time and again. Jesus is the greatest person of the ages, the proudest achievement of the human race, because he taught absolute religion. — *Relation, &c.*, p. 17. But is this so certain? Whether Jesus did teach absolute religion, he tells us, (*Discourse*, p. 243,) is very difficult to answer; for it is no easy matter to decide what is Christianity, and no two men seem to be agreed as to what it is; finally, such is the character of the records, that not much stress can be laid on them; *Ib.* p. 249; and, after all, the question, whether this or that historical person did teach absolute religion is of small consequence to the race. *Ib.* 257.

The whole merit of Jesus consists in the fact that he taught absolute religion, — which, after all, is quite doubtful! But suppose he did teach absolute religion, does that imply any great merit on the part of Jesus? "*To ascertain what is absolute religion is no difficult matter.*" For religion is not an external thing like astronomy, to be learned only by long observation and the perfection of scientific instruments and algebraic processes; but something above all, inward and natural to man." — *Ib.* pp. 240, 241. Nothing very wonderful, then, that this "Galilean youth, who strode before the world whole thousands of years," should have discovered and taught it, and especially, since it is, according to the whole tenor of your teaching, intuitively obvious to every man, woman, and child of the race. Mr. Parker would find it not amiss, when he wishes to say fine things of our blessed Saviour, to stop and ask whether his general notions of Christianity will sustain him in doing so. These eulogiums on Jesus which we meet in Mr. Parker's writings are exceedingly offensive to intelligent readers; for they are altogether too extravagant, assuming Jesus to be what

Mr. Parker represents him, and shockingly irreverent, if Jesus be what Christians believe him to be. Yet we suspect he throws them in to sustain his character before the blushing — no, not *blushing* — maidens of either sex who make up his public, and to escape, if possible, the charge of absolute infidelity.

But, after all, what is this absolute religion, absolute morality, about which our prophet of the nineteenth century keeps up such an unceasing sing-song? From the phrase itself, and the emphasis with which it is pronounced, the innocent reader is fain to imagine that it means something, and something of the last importance. What, then, is it? The answer in brief is: Be good and do good, and you will — be good and do good. Vary the phrase as you will, mystify the subject as you please, this is the whole sum and substance of what Mr. Parker means by absolute religion. Although he may call it “Perfect obedience to the law of God,” “Love to God and to man,” “Absolute goodness,” or by various other names.

Absolute religion may also be defined, according to Mr. Parker, to be the fulfilment of the law of nature. “The law of God,” he tells us in many places, is the law which “God wrote in man’s nature,” and is the law revealed by our natural, moral, and religious sentiments. To be good and to do good, then, according to him, will be to be in harmony with this law, and to obey all its precepts. Now, we demand proof that the fulfilment of the law of nature is absolute religion, all that God demands of us. “Absolute religion,” he says, “is perfect obedience to the law of God, perfect love towards God and man, exhibiting itself in a life allowing and demanding a harmonious action of all man’s faculties.” — *Discourse*, p. 241. Here it is evident that the harmonious action of all man’s faculties, so far as they act at all, is the fulfilment of the law of God, and all that Mr. Parker means by perfect love to God and man. Is this enough? Mr. Parker says it is. On what authority? On his own intuitions? But the belief of all the world, the best evidence the nature of the case admits of what are their intuitions, is against him; and why are we bound to credit his intuitions against theirs? Is he infallible? How does he know that God has not made us subject to a law above our nature, and which we cannot fulfil by our natural strength, and therefore not without Divine grace supernaturally infused, or shed abroad in our hearts? Christian faith is here against him; on what authority does he presume to set that faith aside? On the authority of intuition? But the fact, that the Christian

world has entertained it, lived for it, suffered for it, died for it, is a triumphant proof that intuition cannot be successfully appealed to against it ; for the millions who have believed it have had intuitions as well as Mr. Parker, and, according to his own doctrine, intuitions as authoritative as his own. Man, he says, is the measure of man. Then the intuitions of a Christian — for in becoming a Christian one does not cease to be a man — are as good as his, and are to weigh as much in the argument.

Does he appeal to discursive reason? From what premises will he demonstrate the falsity of the Christian's belief in accountability to a supernatural law? For he must do this, before he has demonstrated that fulfilling the law of nature is absolute religion. We should like to see him undertake to construct a syllogism which should demonstrate either the falsity of the Christian faith or the sufficiency of the law of nature. Does he appeal to Jesus Christ? But Jesus Christ does not sustain him; and, if he did, it would not avail him, for he says,—*Ib.* p. 280, — that Jesus is not the sanction and authority of Christianity, and elsewhere contends that the character of the teacher depends on the character of the doctrine, and not the truth of the doctrine on the character of the teacher. How, then, will he even prove that what he asserts to be absolute religion is absolute religion? Does he expect us to take it on his word? Is he incapable of deceiving or of being deceived? We assure him, high as is our respect for him, we are as loath to admit his infallibility as he is that of the Pope.

But this is not the only difficulty. He tells us, absolute religion is perfect obedience to the law of God. Granted; but what is perfect obedience to the law of God? What does this law command me to do in each particular case in which I may be called to act? Are there no cases in which it is difficult to decide what is the command of God, — no cases of conscience, which every man, woman, or child cannot decide infallibly, and *instantly*? Is Mr. Parker prepared to assert this? If not, — and we cannot believe he is, — what does he tell us, when he tells us absolute religion is perfect obedience to the law of God, but a vague generality, from which we can gather as little practical instruction as warmth from the moonshine in a clear, cold, winter night? It is no great matter to tell people to keep the law of God. It is like the preacher we once listened to, who kept saying to his congregation, "Come, now, be clever, be clever, be good folks." Men have always believed they ought to keep the law of God; but their difficulty under the in-

tellectual aspect of the subject has been, to know what the law of God in all cases demands. Absolute religion is not absolute, unless it answers all questions in particular as well as in general.

But a more serious difficulty lies behind, — a difficulty which our “greater Messiah,” who speaks in such patronizing tones of Jesus Christ, does not seem to have dreamed of, — namely, how are men to be induced to keep the law, even in case they know it? The will is more at fault than the intellect, and is not always nor generally set right by enlightening the intellect. We know our duty, but do it not. Here is a formidable difficulty to be overcome. How do you propose to overcome it? Do you or do you not recognize the necessity of Divine grace to incline the will and to impart strength to obey? If not, do tell us how the disobedient are to become obedient; how the perversity of the will is to be overcome, and the man to be brought practically into harmony with the law of God. If you say yes, we demand of you where, in your absolute religion, which is only what man’s natural moral and religious sentiments reveal, and which therefore is itself only natural, you find any intimation of grace, since grace is necessarily supernatural. Is there grace, or is there not? If not, your obedience is impossible; if there is, your absolute religion is not absolute, is insufficient, for it does not reveal grace, nor furnish it.

Then, again, what shall be done with the disobedient? If a man fails in his perfect obedience, is he abandoned by his Maker to his disobedience? If he recover from his disobedience, is his former disobedience pardoned? You demand *perfect* obedience. Be it so. But a man who disobeyed yesterday has not perfect obedience, though he obey to-day. What is to be done with him? Is his past disobedience remitted on condition of his present obedience? Do you say yes? On what authority? Of the Christian revelation? You deny that authority, and therefore have no more right to plead it when it is in your favor, than you admit we have when it is against you. On the authority of your absolute religion? But your absolute religion does not go out of nature, and nature is inexorable, knows no remission. Do you say there is no pardon? Then you leave the sinner without hope, to suffer eternally the agony of remorse; and, moreover, declare it immoral for us to forgive our enemies, making revenge a virtue;

for, if God does not forgive, we ought not to forgive. Are you prepared to admit these conclusions? If not, admit, as a man, that your absolute religion is a — humbug.

You tell us to be good and do good, and then we shall be good and do good. As if we were blockheads enough not to know this without being told it. But what is it to be good and do good? Love God and man. Very good. But what is it to love God? To have a mere natural sentiment or affection for him, like that which we have for those of our fellow-beings we love? Then we are incapable of loving him; for in this sense we can love only a being individualized to our senses. Is it to keep his commandments, as says our blessed Saviour, “If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments”? Then what are these commandments? To love God and man. But this is no answer; for the love to God is in keeping his commandments, in willing and doing what he wills us to do. There is no love to God, where there is utter ignorance of his commandments. Hence, faith before charity, as the indispensable condition of charity, till faith is lost in vision. What, again, is love to man? Simple philanthropy, the natural sentiment of kindness and good-will? Or is it our natural love elevated above nature by the charity of God shed abroad in our hearts? If the former, we can love only those who are agreeable to us; for nature cannot love what is repugnant to nature. If the latter, what are the conditions on which this charity is infused? What the conditions of recovering it, if lost? What light does your absolute religion, which merely says, Be good and do good and you will be good and do good, throw on these questions? To be of any practical value, it should tell us what is good, good in all things, all actions, at all times and under all circumstances, good now and good for ever; and it is sheer nonsense to call it absolute religion, unless it do this. If it only answer in general, without answering any thing in particular, it answers to little purpose; and if it do not answer all possible questions, both in general and in particular, it is an abuse of language to call it absolute.

You have here written, preached, printed, and published a whole sermon to prove what nobody was ever stupid enough to doubt, namely, that goodness is goodness, is good, nay, excellent. Most grave and reverend teacher, why do you not tell us what is goodness, and how it may be acquired, on what conditions, by what agencies, means, influences, helps, human or divine, natural or supernatural? The world has always ad-

mitted that we ought to be good, that goodness is good, nay, best ; but enslaved by the flesh, the devil, and the goods of this present life, we feel a repugnance to what is good, relish what is evil, and neglect eternal good for that which is slight and transient. Here is the evil to be cured ; and if you are so great an admirer of goodness, why not apply yourself to its cure ? And be assured, you will do little to cure it by screaming constantly in our ears, " Fools, madmen, priests, and idiots, goodness is goodness, — I tell you. I, Theodore Parker, tell you, — I tell you, goodness is goodness, is good, — nay, excellent."

But under all this lies a covert design. Mr. Parker is not so stupid as to suppose that these stale commonplaces and vague generalities are of any practical importance. In his mouth the formula, Be good and do good and you will — be good and do good, has an important significance. So has the assertion, that goodness is excellent. What is the thought with which all this is said ? It is simply, that all that is called good, or regarded by the religious world as important or necessary to the spiritual life, not expressly required by the law of nature, or revealed by our moral and religious sentiments, is *not* good, and has no relation to goodness ; and that the goodness which is by nature is goodness, and all the goodness there is or should be aspired to. What he is striving to do is, to set up nature against grace, and natural religion against revealed religion. This is the whole sum and substance of his meaning. Hence, when he says we should approach God face to face, he does not intend to teach that man can really see God face to face, but that we should content ourselves with our natural knowledge of God ; and when he discards the Mediator, it is not because he supposes we stand in immediate union with God, but because he would have man rely wholly on himself, on his own nature, and not trouble himself about any union with God, to which he is not naturally equal.

Mr. Parker expresses a warm admiration of the character of Jesus ; but, if you analyze the matter, you will find that he admires him because he believes, or persuades himself that he believes, Jesus discarded all supernatural revelation, all historical religions of all kinds and sorts, and all authority in religious matters but the simple light of nature ; thus making the individual the sole judge for himself, by his own natural intuition, of all questions of truth and duty, in which he set an example

which every one of his professed followers ought to follow. In other words, Jesus was a bold, uncompromising infidel ; that is, in regard to all which, in his age and country, was called religion ; and therefore, in every age, the true follower of Jesus is an infidel, disbelieving what the age believes, and speaking out, from his own heart and soul, what he, by his own natural light, is led to embrace as truth. Here is the whole ground of Mr. Parker's admiration of our blessed Saviour, and this ground is altogether untenable. For the language of our Saviour was, " Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." In no instance does he reject the authority of Moses and the prophets, or assume that the Synagogue was not established by God in the supernatural and miraculous sense the Jews themselves believed. It is true, he supersedes the Jewish dispensation, but by fulfilling it ; because he was the reality, of which it was only the type.

So, again, Mr. Parker's moral judgments are all founded on the supposition that true morality requires one to be always in opposition to the established order, whatever it may be. His theory seems to be, that, as soon as a doctrine is once fairly embraced, it should be rejected, and a new doctrine invented and set forth. He always finds the enemies of God and man in the friends of reigning doctrines and fixed institutions. With him, the presumption is, that the man who is a rebel, disobedient to all authority, and indignant at all restraint, is a moral man, a noble soul, and a true child of God. He claims our reverence for himself, on the ground that he has the courage to stand up boldly and arraign the whole world, and denounce all that the world has hitherto venerated and obeyed. In a word, with him, the noblest minds and purest hearts are those who scorn to obey. Lucifer rebelling against God and challenging supremacy with the Almighty is his highest ideal of moral sublimity, and the worthiest model for all who would attain to saintly and heroic virtue. It is not the glorious sun, nor the fixed stars that stud the firmament as so many sapphire gems, that attract his admiration ; but the vapory comet, dashing along, and whisking his watery tail in every sober planet's face. His glory is to destroy ; and despairing of constructing the temple, he trusts to be renowned for burning it. With him bitter is sweet, and sweet is bitter.

A great, perhaps *the* great, moral doctrine Mr. Parker sets forth is, that we are Christians by being what Jesus was ; that

Jesus was simply the model of what we should be and may be. "The goodness actual in me is possible for all." — *Relation*, p. 18. "Can Mr. Parker exert a bad moral influence," ask his friends, "since he holds up Jesus as the ideal of true moral worth, and preaches that all may be, and should be, what he was, — equally great, equally good, equally perfect?" Yes, if he interpret the moral worth of Jesus to be only that of a Voltaire or a Tom Paine. But admitting he does not so interpret it, admitting that he allows Jesus the moral worth ascribed to him by the Evangelists, how can he prove his doctrine? If Jesus was what the Evangelists and the Church say he was, we cannot be what he was; for he was God, as well as man. If we reject the testimony of the Evangelists and the Church, both of which Mr. Parker does reject, we know and can affirm nothing of Jesus at all, one way or the other. Waive this, however; assume that Jesus was, as Unitarians say, a man; how does it follow from the fact that one of our race has been what he was, that all can become the same, any more than, from the fact that there has been one Homer, it follows that every man may be a Homer? It would be gratifying to some of us, if Mr. Parker would undertake to prove some of his great doctrines.

Mr. Parker is not only a great scholar, a great theologian, a great moralist, but he is also a great metaphysician. Natural things, he says, reveal the Infinite. "But they are to us only a revelation of something kindred to qualities that are awakened in ourselves." — *Excellence of Goodness*, p. 4. His doctrine is, that the type of all we know is *a priori* in ourselves; and knowing is nothing but a perception of the harmony between the object and this type, or, according to Plato, *idea*, in ourselves. Hence, to know an object to be a jackass is to perceive its harmony with something kindred to a jackass in ourselves. Proceeding from this profound axiom, Mr. Parker obtains a sublime theory of human progress. First, in the order of our ideas, is POWER; second, WISDOM, or intellectual capacity; and, last of all, GOODNESS. In the first epoch, men deify physical force, and worship a *strong* God; in the second, they deify wisdom, or intellectual capacity, and worship a *wise* God; in the third, goodness, and worship a *good* God. All this is admirable; but where is the proof? It has not one particle of historical evidence, and is nothing but mere theory. Men have always held to the

supremacy of goodness, and have merely erred as to what constitutes goodness. But what assurance has Mr. Parker, or what assurance can he give us, that he does not also err? Is he infallible? What is remarkable is, that the present age, more than any preceding one of which we have any record, falls into what Mr. Parker regards as the error of unduly exalting intellectual power; whereas, on Mr. Parker's theory, we should be remarkable for assigning to goodness its rightful supremacy. The great objection brought against what we call the Dark Ages is, that they made more account of piety and good morals than of mere intellectual greatness. But, in point of fact, men's notions of what is good do not determine the character they ascribe to God; but their notions of God determine their notions of good. Thus, in our own language, we call both God and Good by the same name, — not because we first conceive of God as good, but because we first conceive good to be that which conforms to God, participates of the Divine nature, — is Godlike. The nouns of a language must be logically older than its adjectives.

Mr. Parker denounces the religious world, in his usual flip-pant manner, for having contended for belief and outward worship. Yet he himself says, "*No doubt, there are two parts to the service of God, — Faith and Love within the man, Works and Goodness without the man.*" — *Excellence of Goodness*, p. 13. 1. Here note, goodness, of which he so extols the excellence, is confessed to be *outward*, merely the outward expression of faith and love within the man. The chief concern, one would suppose, then, should be with the faith and love within. Make the tree good, and the fruit will be good; and what else has been and is the strenuous endeavour of the Church in all her teachings, exhortations, sacraments, and discipline? We should like to be told when or where the Church, or any minister of the Church, high or low, has ever taught that any outward service, whether directed towards God or towards man, was worth any thing, if faith and love were wanting within; nay, even if faith and love were within, if not also the divine principle of charity. *Si linguis hominum loquar, et angelorum, charitatem autem non habeam, factus sum velut æs sonans, aut cymbalum tinniens. Et si habuero prophetiam, et noverim mysteria omnia, et omnem scientiam: et si habuero omnem fidem ita ut montes transferam, charitatem autem non, nihil sum. Et si distribuero in cibos pauperum omnes facultates meas, et si tradidero corpus*

meum ita ut ardeam, charitatem autem non habuero, nihil mihi prodest. — 1 Cor. xiii. 1 – 3. This has always and universally been the language of the Church from the days of St. Paul down to the latest Catholic priest who has received Holy Orders, and is what every one of the faithful is taught and believes throughout the whole world. If Mr. Parker doubts it, let him read our ascetic books, and the most popular of them all with the great body of Catholics, the *De Imitatione Christi*. A few hours' study of the ascetic works of the Church will teach this man, who accuses the Church of being outward and formal, that he has not as yet taken his first lesson in spiritual religion, — that he has never yet penetrated beyond sentiment and imagination. A more unspiritual writer it would be difficult to find. As a proof of his ignorance of the spiritual life, take the following from a chapter on *Solid Piety*.

“The passage from sin to salvation, — this second birth of the soul, as both Christians and heathens call it, is one of the many mysteries of man. Two elements meet in the soul. There is a negation of the past, an affirmation of the future. Terror and hope, penitence and faith, rush together in that moment, and a new life begins. The character gradually grows over the wounds of sin. With bleeding feet the man retreads his way, but gains at last the mountain-top of life, and wonders at the tortuous track he left behind.” — *Discourse*, p. 151.

This is excellent ! What denies ? What affirms ? What excites terror and hope, produces penitence and faith ? And faith, penitence, and hope are in the soul prior to the generation of the new life ! O, go and study at the foot of the cross, and you will soon be sick of venting these pretty sentimentalisms and rhetorical inanities !

2. But, note again, — to the production of goodness, which is out of the man, Mr. Parker makes faith in the man to be necessary. Here is a precious confession. This man, who has been berating the Christian world for insisting on faith, now himself is forced to own that it is necessary to the production of goodness, which he has been contending is alone the excellent thing ! And faith is to believe what we see not, and, as we have in a preceding article proved, to believe truth, and not falsehood. So Mr. Parker would do well to eat his own words. “If they [the Christian world] laid the main stress on real piety in the heart, that were well ; for it would be making the tree good, when of course its fruit would also

be good." — *Excellence of Goodness*, p. 13. Real piety, according to Mr. Parker, is faith and love within the man. The main stress should, then, be laid on these, because that is making the tree good ; and if the tree be good, there is no danger but the fruit will be good also. Out of Mr. Parker's own mouth, then, we condemn him. He lays the main stress on goodness, and the design of his sermon is to prove its excellence. But goodness he says is *out* of the man. It is not real piety, but a fruit of real piety. Can he get the fruit without the real piety ? Can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit ? Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles ? Why, then, does he lay the main stress on goodness, and not on the faith and love without which the goodness cannot be produced ? And why has he the impudence to misrepresent the Church, and to denounce her, for doing the very thing, which, according to his own confession, she ought to have done ?

But enough. We have no patience to proceed farther. What we have said will show clearly enough where Mr. Parker's true place is. That he may believe he is laboring in a good cause, for a good end, though hard to conceive, is possible ; for there is no end to the delusions to which one is exposed the moment he plants himself on his own assumed divinity, and starts from the principle of his own sufficiency for himself. The principle of self-reliance, as they call it, but of *self-sufficiency*, as they should call it, so loudly boasted by our Transcendentalists, and which is nothing but Pelagianism pushed to its last consequences, can be adopted only with extreme peril. It is the principle which occasioned the fall of the angels, — its proper name is PRIDE, the primal sin, and mother of all sin. A man blown up by pride, full of the persuasion that he has all in his own nature that he needs, is an easy prey to the devil ; and there is no error so extravagant, or so absurd, or so pernicious, that he may not be led to embrace it as God's truth. Mr. Parker, therefore, may possibly believe that he is engaged in a glorious work ; he may look upon himself as a confessor, and almost as a martyr, to the truth ; but he stands in the ranks of the rebellious and the disobedient, among proud, conceited, and superficial infidels. He is doing battle for the enemies of God and his Christ. It is useless, by fine words and vague and circumlocutory phrases, to seek to disguise this fact. He is, to all intents and purposes, a rejecter of the Gospel, and he accepts no part of

Christianity, save what Christianity herself takes from the law of nature. This he may, indeed, accept ; for this is common to all religions and all moralities. But the law of nature, though presupposed and accepted by the Gospel, is not the Gospel. The Gospel, properly so called, belongs wholly to the supernatural order, that is to say, all that is peculiar to the Gospel, or distinctive in the Christian dispensation, the belief and observance of which constitutes one a Christian. All this Mr. Parker undeniably rejects. He is, for this reason, what all the world mean by an unbeliever, — an infidel. Let him, then, be so marked and received. If he chooses to be an infidel, he can be ; so if a man chooses to be a thief or a murderer, he can be ; but at his own peril. As those who value their property or their lives give no countenance to thieves and murderers ; so let those who value faith and salvation give no countenance to the infidel. You cannot touch pitch and not be defiled.

Mr. Parker is dangerous, because the tendencies of a large portion of the Protestant world are in the direction he takes, and he seems to be but giving voice to what already lies struggling for utterance in the minds and hearts of thousands. In this fact is the secret of his popularity, and the pledge of his temporary success. And yet, in the good providence of God, this may be well. It is perhaps well that error should develope itself, and the inevitable result of false principles be fully exemplified. Men will see thus whither they are tending, and, recoiling with horror from the precipice, return to the Fountain of Life, submit themselves to God, and find peace and rest for their souls.

ART. IV.—*Woman in the Nineteenth Century*. By S. MARGARET FULLER. New York: Greeley & McElrath. 1845. 12mo. pp. 201.

MISS FULLER belongs to the class described in the preceding article under the name of *Transcendentalists*, of which sect she is the chieftainess. She has a broader and richer nature than Mr. Parker, greater logical ability, and deeper poetic feeling ; more boldness, sincerity, and frankness, and perhaps

equal literary attainments. But at bottom they are brother and sister, children of the same father, belong to the same school, and in general harmonize in their views, aims, and tendencies. Their differences are, that he is more of the theologian, she more of the poet ; he more of the German in his taste, she more of the Grecian ; he the more popular in his style of writing, she the more brilliant and fascinating in her conversation. In the Saint-Simonian classification of the race, he would belong to the class of *savans*, she to that of *artistes*.

But Miss Fuller is an *artiste* only in her admiration of art, for she has little artistic skill. Nothing is or can be less artistic than the book before us, which, properly speaking, is no book, but a long talk on matters and things in general, and men and women in particular. It has neither beginning, middle, nor end, and may be read backwards as well as forwards, and from the centre outwards each way, without affecting the continuity of the thought or the succession of ideas. We see no reason why it should stop where it does, or why the lady might not keep on talking in the same strain till doomsday, unless prevented by want of breath.

The title gives no clew to the character of the work ; for it is no part of its design to sketch, as one would suppose, the condition of woman in the nineteenth century. Indeed, we do not know what is its design. We cannot make out what thesis or what theses it does or does not maintain. All is profoundly obscure, and thrown together in "glorious confusion." We can attempt no analysis of its contents. As talk, it is very well, and proves that the lady has great talkative powers, and that, in this respect at least, she is a genuine woman.

As we read along in the book, we keep constantly asking, What is the lady driving at ? What does she want ? But no answer comes. She does not know, herself, what she wants. She has an ugly feeling of uneasiness, that matters do not go right with her ; and she firmly believes that if she had — I know not what — all would go better. She is feverish, and turns from one side of the bed to the other, but finds no relief. The evil she finds, and which all her class find, is in her, in them, and is removed by no turning or change of posture, and can be. She and they are, no doubt, to be compassionated, to be tenderly nursed and borne with, as are all sick people. It is no use attempting to reason them out of their crotchets ; but well people should take care not to heed what they say, and especially not to receive the ravings of their delirium as divine inspirations.

Seriously, Miss Fuller does not know what she wants, any more than does many a fine lady, whom silks, laces, shawls, dogs, parrots, balls, routs, jams, watering-places, and despair of lover or husband and friends have ceased to satisfy. She even confesses her inability to formula her complaint. She has a strange gnawing within, an indefinable craving for what she has not, does not know how to get, where to find, — a very unpleasant condition, no doubt, but not an uncommon one. Poor girl! hers is but the common lot of all her Protestant and infidel sisters, and brothers too; for her brothers are hardly less subject to the vapors than her sisters. They are all seeking they know not what, craving what they have not, find not, — now seizing on this bawble, now on that, — a bonnet, ribbon, shawl, cravat, coat, minister, sect, association; but all to no purpose. The craving remains; nothing satisfies; the aching heart nothing fills. Cook the vegetable oyster as they will, serve it up with what condiments, flanked by what sauces, they please, it is never the genuine oyster.

“O, give us something to love!” exclaim a bevy of dear, sweet, enchanting creatures. “Give us something to love; we were made to love”; and round they look with fond eyes and loving hearts, but as ever there is the gnawing, the aching void within. Love is the be-all, the cure-all, the end-all; but, alas, there is nothing to love; no one knows how to love; no one knows how to respond to the true, fond, loving heart. Try again, — again, — another, — another, and still another; — ’t is vain. The heart is not met; is not filled; is emptier than ever. Surely there is some mistake. The Creator committed a blunder when he made the world, especially when he made man and woman. Man and woman, it is true, as says our authoress, are but “two halves of one thought”; but the right halves do not come together, or do not match. They get mismatched. Mrs. Jones has got my other half, and I have got Mrs. Peter Smith’s, — or am cheated out of it altogether. All this is very provoking, no doubt. To be made capable of loving, to have this free, pure, rich heart, full to overflowing with love, containing a whole ocean of love, large as the Atlantic, nay, as the five oceans together, and warm enough to thaw out either pole, and no one I can love, — nobody but Jim Jones or Peter Smith, — ’t is intolerable.

The terrible evil here set forth Miss Fuller thinks is confined exclusively to her own sex. Men have the advantage; with them it is not so bad. There she is wrong. There are those

who have beards on their faces, as well as those who have none, who have these cravings, these hearts full of love, such as it is, and an aching void in these same full hearts, because there is no one for them to love. They cannot love Bridget or Sukey, and all but the Bridgets and Sukeys are—not for them. Men are not much more easily satisfied than women; and if women are forced to take to tea, scandal, philanthropy, evening-meetings, and smelling-bottles, men are forced to take to trade, infidelity, sometimes the pistol, and even to turn *reformers*, the most desperate resort of all. All this is sad enough, and really under all this is a grievous evil, of which no serious-minded man will make light. But what is the remedy?

Miss Fuller, so far as we collect her thought from her interminable prattle, seems to think this evil is to be remedied by having it understood that woman has an immortal soul, and by securing her free scope to develope herself. But what change this implies, or would introduce, Yankee as we are, we are unable to guess. Understand that woman has an immortal soul! Why, we are far beyond that already. Read our poets, listen to our philanthropists, abolitionists, Fourierists, Saint-Simonians, dietetic reformers, and other reformers of all sorts and sizes, of all manner of things in the universe, and some others, and you shall find that she is already a divinity, and adored as such. Who has not heard of the “divine Fanny,” or not been eager to adore as she made his heart jump by her capers and pirouettes? Not her soul only, but woman’s body, is held to be divine, divine from head to foot, and we go into ecstasy of devotion at sight of a “divine ankle.” In our ordinary prosaic language, is not woman an “angel,” “an angel of purity,” of “loveliness,” and “too holy for earth”? and they who scorn to bend the knee before their Maker, are they not ready to prostrate themselves at her feet, and kiss the very ground on which she stands?

“The more fools they. But this is not what we want. This is sickening, disgusting.” And yet there are comparatively few women seriously offended at it, if they themselves are its object, even though offered by those they have good reasons for believing are double-distilled villains. But enough of this. There are evils, great evils, no doubt, to which both men and women are subject. Neither sex is what it should be, or finds always the fair weather and smooth sea the heart may crave; but we have yet to be convinced that woman’s lot, compared with that of man’s, is one of peculiar hardship. She is

not always the victim, and examples of suffering virtue may be found amongst men as well as amongst women. No doubt, there are evils enough to redress, but we do not think the insane clamor for "woman's rights," for "woman's equality," "woman's liberation," and all this, will do much to redress them. Woman is no more deprived of her rights than man is of his, and no more enslaved. Woman as to her moral and spiritual nature has always been emancipated by Christianity, and placed as a human being on the same platform with man. She is treated, and always has been treated, by Christianity as having an immortal soul, and as personally accountable to her Maker. In this respect man has no claims, and is allowed no preëminence, over her ; and what more can she ask ?

In the distribution of the several spheres of social and domestic action, woman has assigned to her one sphere, and man another ; both equally important, equally honorable. This therefore is no cause of complaint. — But who assigned her this sphere ? Has she given her consent to be confined to it ? Has she ever been consulted ? her assent asked ? — And what if not ? Who assigned man his sphere ? was his assent asked or obtained ? Their appropriate spheres are allotted to man and woman by their Creator, and all they have to do is to submit, as quietly, and with as good a grace, as they can. Miss Fuller thinks it is man who has crowded woman one side, and refused her full scope for self-development ; and although the sphere in which she moves may really be that most appropriate to her, yet man has no right to confine her to it, and forbid her to take another if she prefer it. She should be as free to decide her own destiny as man is his. All very plausible. But God, and not man, has assigned her the appropriate sphere ; and, moreover, we must be ungallant enough to question Miss Fuller's leading doctrine of the perfect social and political equality of the sexes. She says man is not the head of the woman. We, on the authority of the Holy Ghost, say he is. The dominion was not given to woman, nor to man and woman conjointly, but to the man. Therefore the inspired Apostle, while he commands husbands to love and cherish their wives, commands wives to love and *obey* their husbands ; and, even setting aside all considerations of divine inspiration, St. Paul's authority is, to say the least, equal to that of Miss Fuller.

Miss Fuller would have all offices, professions, callings, pursuits thrown open to woman as to man ; and seems to think that the lost Eden will not be recovered till the petticoat carries

it over the breeches. She is quite sure the ancient heathens understood this matter better than we do. They had a juster appreciation of the dignity of woman. Their principal divinities were goddesses, and women ministered in the fane, and gave the responses of the oracles. She is greatly taken with Isis, Sita, Egyptian Sphinx, Ceres, Proserpine. Would she recall these ancient heathen deities, their ancient worship, filled with obscene rites and frightful orgies? Would she restore the Isiac worship? revive that of Syrian Astarte? reëstablish the old custom which prevailed at Babylon, according to which every woman, on a certain festival, must prostitute herself to the first comer in honor of the goddess? readopt the old Phœnician method of obtaining marriage portions for dowerless daughters? have carried again in public procession certain pleasant images which Roman dames were eager to crown with wreaths of flowers? or reproduce the wild Bacchantes with loosened tresses and loosened robes, and lascivious satyrs? These and far worse obtained in the worship of those female divinities, and where woman served the fane, and gave the responses of the gods. Has it never occurred to our learned and philosophic lady to ask, if there was not some relation of cause and effect between the part women took in these ancient religions, and these filthy rites and shameful practices?

We ask not this last question because we would imply that women are less pure, or more easily corrupted, than men. We are not likely to fall into the common herd of libellers of women, and sneerers at female virtue. We have lived too long, or been too fortunate in our acquaintances, to think lightly of woman's worth, or woman's virtues. We remember too vividly the many kind offices we have received from her hand, the firmness with which she has clung to us in adversity, when all the world had deserted us, and also the aid which her rapid intuitions and far-glancing sense has afforded us in our mental and moral progress, if we have made any, to be in danger of this. It has been our good fortune to have experienced all woman's tenderness, all her sympathy when we were in sorrow and destitution, her joy when the world brightened to us, her generous self-forgetfulness and self-sacrifices for the beloved of her heart, and the sweet and gentle companionship in intellectual pursuits and in moral duties which seems to double man's power and to make virtue thrice more amiable; and we do not feel, that, so long as we retain our memory, we can be in danger of speaking lightly of woman, or of doing her injustice. But though we

say all this, and could say much more, we still say the two sexes cannot mingle in certain spheres, and on the terms Miss Fuller proposes, without the mutual corruption of both. The fault is not woman's more than man's, perhaps not so much ; but the fact is no less certain. While we live in the flesh, restraint and mortification are our law, — whether for men or for women. The things which look to us so enchanting, which even are not bad within certain limits, the glowing pictures of our innocent imaginations, the bright ideals of our youth, — alas ! human nature is rotten, trust it not. They who imposed the restraints against which Miss Fuller protests, who separated the sphere of the sexes, and assigned to each as far as possible a separate line of duty, if they were men, must have known all too well what they were about. They may have been men who had lost their innocency; but if so, they had gained — experience.

The first mistake which Miss Fuller commits is the mistake committed by all reformers, — from him who undertook in the Garden to reform God's commandment to our first parents, down to the author of the "Orphic Sayings," — that the true moral and social state is to be introduced and secured by the free, full, and harmonious development of human nature. This mistake is committed everywhere. Go where we will, out of the Catholic world, we meet it. We find it with Deists and Atheists, with German Rationalists and American Transcendentalists, in the fanciful theories of Gall and Spurzheim, in the dreams of Charles Fourier and Saint-Simon. It is the settled doctrine, and only settled doctrine, of modern philosophy, and apparently the fixed creed of the whole Protestant and infidel worlds, — exception to be made, perhaps, in favor of the Puseyites, and the few remnants of the old Calvinistic sects. It is embraced and hotly defended by hundreds and thousands who have no suspicion of its direct and glaring hostility to experience and revelation. Nothing can be false or more dangerous than this delusion. Nature does not suffice. Nature cannot be trusted. Away with your wretched cant about "faith in man, in man's nature," his "lofty capacities," "glorious affinities," and "Godlike tendencies." Nature, we repeat, is rotten ; trust it not. The fairest, sweetest, purest, dearest affections nature ever knows lead us most wofully astray, and will do so, if not restrained, whatever your moral codes or social arrangements. There is no such thing as a harmonious development of nature. Cultivate nature as you will, observe the nicest balance between all its tendencies, and, before you know it, before you

can dream of it, one rascally passion has suddenly gained the mastery, and all is confusion and anarchy within. Nature is cursed. For six thousand years you have cultivated it, and it has yielded you only briars and thorns ; cultivate it as you will for six thousand years to come, and it will yield you nothing else. "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption."

Another mistake, not less fatal, is also committed by our reformers. They see there are evils, that men and women suffer, and suffer horribly. Their sympathies are awakened, and they seek if relief cannot be found. All this is well, commendable even. But they assume that relief is to come here, and the good craved, but found not, is to be realized in this world, in this probationary life. "The highest ideal man can form of his own powers," says Miss Fuller, "that he is destined to attain." And this ideal is to be attained here. But Eden, the terrestrial paradise, is lost, never to be regained. Man forfeited it, and has been driven forth from it, never to repose again in its fragrant bowers, or beneath its refreshing shades. The earth is cursed ; do what you will, rebel as you please, the curse is irrevocable. This world is a prison-house, and escape you cannot till death sets you free. The sooner you come to this conclusion, the better for you, the better for all. This life is and must be a discipline, a probation, a warfare. You must stand on your guard, always in arms, sleepless, and fight, fight for your life, with enemies from all quarters, and of all sorts and sizes, till you are called home to enjoy the victory and the triumph.

We know this is an unpalatable truth to our zealous philanthropists, and we know the scorn and derision with which they will treat it. But the realization of a heaven on earth is not the end for which the Gospel was given us. Our Maker has not abandoned us ; far from it. He has prepared something far better for us than a terrestrial paradise. He has prepared heaven and its eternal beatitude for us. But we can enjoy that here only through faith and hope. It is ours here only by promise. It is set before us as a glorious prize, as an exceeding rich reward ; but it is not to be gained without the dust and heat of the race ; nor will it be bestowed till the race is run, till the battle is fought, till the victory is won. Consolations we may have, consolations which the world knows not, cannot give, cannot take away. Angels will minister unto us and revive our fainting strength ; but happiness, the full freedom and joy

of the soul, are tasted not till the songs and harps of angels welcome us home to our Father's house.

True wisdom consists in fixing our eyes on this heavenly reward, and throwing off all that we may win it. We must count the sufferings of this present life not worthy to be compared with the glory hereafter to be revealed ; we must despise the joys of this life, and trample the world under our feet. *Beati pauperes spiritu.* We must despise riches and honors, we must joy in poverty and destitution, and count all things as mere dross for the sake of Chrst. This is the law imposed upon us, and no reforms which come not from obedience to this law will avail us aught. Here the struggle, the warfare ; there the triumph, the joy.

But we have no room to proceed. As much as we dislike Miss Fuller's book, as pernicious as we regard the doctrines or notions it contains, as utterly as we are forced to condemn the whole race of modern reformers, — all who are seeking to recover the lost Eden on earth, from the harmonious development of nature alone, — we can still believe, without difficulty, that she may be a pure-minded woman, honestly and earnestly struggling to obtain a greater good for suffering humanity. Taking her starting-point, we should arrive at her conclusion. Believing a terrestrial paradise possible, we should strive for it ; believing the free, full, and harmonious development of human nature the means and condition of obtaining it, we should protest against whatever restrains nature in woman as well as in man. We believe Miss Fuller wholly in the wrong, but we see no occasion for the kind of animadversions on her or her book, which we have noticed in some newspaper criticisms. She has done or said nothing which should be regarded as a sin by her Protestant brethren. In our remarks we have designed nothing personal against her. We are able, we trust, to distinguish between persons and doctrines. For persons, however far gone they may be in error, or even in sin, we trust we have the charity our holy religion commands, and which the recollection of our own errors and sins, equal to any we may have to deplore in others, requires us to exercise. But for erroneous doctrines we have no charity, no tolerance. Error is never harmless, and in no instance to be countenanced.

ART. V.—*The United States Catholic Magazine and Monthly Review*. Edited by REV. CHARLES I. WHITE, and VERY REV. M. J. SPALDING, D. D. Baltimore : John Murphy. Vol. IV. No. III. March, 1845. Svo. pp. 44.

WE notice this periodical because it is the ablest and most exclusively Catholic magazine published in this country, and one deserving to be taken by every one who wishes an excellent literary periodical devoted to the exposition and defence of the doctrines and discipline of the Church. We also notice it for the purpose of making a few remarks suggested or called for by an article which appeared in the number before us, reviewing the first volume of our own Journal. The article is written with ability, but is quite too eulogistic, and speaks of ourselves in terms quite beyond our deserts. But it is not of this we wish to speak. Most men are willing to swallow all the praise they can get. Yet Catholic writers, who may be presumed to believe and to know that the greatest enemies to our progress towards Christian perfection are pride and vainglory, ought to use some measure in their praise of a poor sinner, who probably at best finds it no easy task to practise the humility his religion demands.

The Reviewer refers to an opinion said to have been expressed of us by Lord Brougham. This opinion the newspapers friendly to us have taken considerable pains to circulate. It is a small affair, but we own that we are unwilling it should continue to be quoted ; 1. Because we have not, and never have had, any respect for Lord Brougham's opinion on any subject ; and 2. Because we have good evidence that the anecdote which has circulated in the newspapers is totally false, at least so far as concerns Lord Brougham, who in all probability has never read a page of our writings, or even heard of our name. We are not quite so famous abroad as some of our friends now and then are pleased to represent.

The Reviewer, speaking of our philosophical principles, says we are "rather an Eclectic." Now, to be called an Eclectic is worse than to be commended by Lord Brougham. Some years ago we were an Eclectic, we own, as we have been in the course of our life "all things by turns and nothing long" ; but we disavowed Eclecticism in the *Boston Quarterly Review* for January, 1842, and have not had conscious-

ly any fellowship with it since. After disavowing Eclecticism, we undertook to excogitate a new system of philosophy of our own, which we termed *synthetic philosophy*, — based on principles wholly repugnant to Eclecticism. This system was our hobby during two years and a half, and it brought us, or rather was the occasion of bringing us, to the door of the Catholic Church. We say the *door*; for, though we thought at the time it opened into the temple itself, and led to the very sanctuary, it really led only to the door, and even that accidentally, not necessarily. The truth is, though during those two years and a half we talked much of the Church, and dogmatically too, we knew nothing of it except what we had learned from its enemies, the French Eclectics, the Saint-Simonians, and the Protestants. One year ago, we had read only two Catholic books, to wit, Milner's *End of Controversy*, and the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, and these only partially. We had never seen and conversed with an intelligent Catholic on the subject of religion the value of one hour in our whole life, and of course could have known very little of what Catholicity really is. We guessed at its leading doctrines from our knowledge of the Protestant doctrines opposed to them; and though we often guessed aright, we still oftener blundered. Nevertheless, we had formed to ourselves an ideal Catholicism, demanded by our philosophy and sustained by it; and this ideal Catholicism we imagined was substantially what the Catholic Church believes, or really intends by her articles of faith. So we concluded, about as sagely as in other cases, that we were a Catholic, and had discovered a philosophy which would legitimate the Catholic Church, and give a scientific basis to all her doctrines.

Such was our belief when we commenced the first volume of this Review, and such continued to be our belief till after the publication of our number for July last. But such ceased to be our belief before the publication of the number for October. Whether the system of philosophy for which we contended, and of which we published some fragments, is or is not sound, we do not feel able now to determine. We are sure that it does not necessarily lead to Catholicism; but whether it is necessarily opposed to it we do not know, and cannot decide for ourselves till we have had leisure to review and compare it more fully than we have yet done with what the Church teaches. Our conversion to Catholicity, which rests on other than metaphysical grounds, has so revolutionized our whole mind, presented us a world of thought so entirely new to us, and en-

abled us to see all things in a light so different and so much clearer, that we have very little confidence in the value or soundness of any thing we advanced on our own authority prior to its taking place. Sure we are, that the best things we wrote are mixed up with many things we should now disown. If in our philosophical writings, or in any other of our writings, any thing can be found contrary to the faith of the Catholic Church, we of course disown it ; and we are far from believing that any of us have made or will make any advance in philosophy — except perhaps in the physical sciences — on the old Catholic Schoolmen. For ourselves, we have more confidence in the conclusions of Saint Thomas than we have in our own ; and where we find our conclusions differing from his, we regard it as a strong presumption, to say the least, that ours, not his, are wrong. We lay aside, utterly renounce, all our pretensions to a philosophy of our own ; and content ourselves in this matter, as well as in others, to walk in old paths, instead of striking out new ones. We set no value on what we have done, and request our friends to set no value on it. Our life begins with our birth into the Catholic Church. We say this, because we wish no one to be led astray by any of our former writings, all of which, prior to last October, unless it be the criticisms on Kant, some political essays, and the articles in our present Review on Social Reform and the Anglican Church, we would gladly cancel if we could. We have written and published much during the last twenty years ; but a small duodecimo volume would contain all that we would not blot, published prior to last October.

We have said that we fancied our philosophy conducted necessarily to the Catholic Church. We honestly believed this for a long time, and when we commenced this Journal we had not a doubt but the Catholic Church was the true Church ; but such was the view which we then took of the Church, that we fancied we might consistently, for a time, at least, stay outside of it, and labor to bring the Protestant public to right views of the Church in general. Hence we said, " Stay where you are." We thought we could do more good out of the Church than in it ; and our dream was, that we might, by working in the bosom of our Protestant Churches, prepare them to return to the bosom of Catholic unity. It was a dream, hardly an honest dream, at any rate a very foolish dream ; but it was a brief dream. Logic demanded a plain, open avowal of Catholicism, and we had always a great horror of the mortal sin of being inconsequent. Moreover, another question pressed rather hard,

namely, the question of the salvation of our own soul. If the Catholic Church was the true Church, we could not be saved without being in its communion ; for, admit even that the invincibly ignorant may be saved without being actually in its communion, the plea of invincible ignorance evidently could not avail us, for we believed the Catholic Church to be the true Church. Then, again, we found ourselves in want of the helps that Church had to give. It was idle to contend for the necessity of the Church, if, standing outside of it, we could yet maintain the personal integrity, and attain to the holiness of life, for which the Church with its sacraments was especially instituted. Either, then, stop talking about the Church, or seek its communion. We resolved on the last, and rejected our own doctrine of staying where we were.

When we first applied for instructions, we supposed, in all substantial matters, we were already a very learned Catholic, and that we were so by virtue of our philosophy. Nor were we immediately undeceived. We were first undeceived by a letter from a very dear friend, who had followed us in all our wanderings for many a year, and whom we attempted to persuade to go with us into the Catholic Church. This letter placed before us in a clear and distinct light the logical results of our own philosophical speculations, and showed us that they did not require us to enter the Catholic Church. It convinced us of this fact. We then discovered, what we had not before suspected, that we had drawn our Catholic conclusions not from *data* furnished by our metaphysics, but from another source, which we had not distinctly considered. We found we had all along been carrying on a double train of thought, and with admirable facility, without suspecting it, concluding from one or the other as best suited our convenience. We saw, the moment our attention was directed to the point, that the two trains of thought, though accidentally connected in our own mind, and not distinguished in our reasonings, had no necessary connexion, one with the other. We were, through the aid of the friend we have mentioned, enabled to separate them, and to comprehend the process by which we had come to embrace the Catholic faith, and to see that the grounds of that faith in our own mind were quite distinct from any philosophical speculations whatever.

We have made this statement for the purpose of saving our friends the trouble of trying to discover by what process we obtained the Catholic Church from our metaphysical premises. We did not obtain it from those premises. We were convert-

ed very much as others are, who are led to embrace the Catholic Church. We had already convinced ourselves of the insufficiency of Naturalism, Rationalism, and Transcendentalism ; we had also convinced ourselves of the necessity of Divine revelation, and of the fact that the Christian revelation was such a revelation. From this, by a process of reasoning which may be seen in the first article in this number, we arrived infallibly at the Catholic Church. The process is simple and easy. It requires no metaphysical subtilty, no long train of metaphysical reasoning. All it needs is good common-sense, a reverent spirit, and a disposition to believe on sufficient evidence. In explaining different theological doctrines metaphysics may have a place ; but in establishing faith there is no great demand for them. Earnestness and simplicity of mind are the chief requisites. It will be seen, then, that we do not place any dependence on our former metaphysical speculations, as the ground of our present faith, and do not ask our friends to seek through them a door of entrance into the Church. They, who attempt by metaphysics to find their way to belief in the supernatural revelation God has made, will most likely get bewildered and fail of the end. The truths of revelation must be taken simply, on plain, positive evidence ; they are not attained to by human wisdom alone. After twenty years and more of wandering in search of a new and better way to the truth, we have been forced to come back, to sit in all humility and docility at the feet of our blessed Saviour, and learn in the old way, as our fathers did before the experiments of Luther and Calvin. We become a fool that we may become wise, consent to know nothing that we may know all. We have found no new way, we have only found the old way. But this old way, beaten by millions of travellers for these eighteen hundred years, is sufficient for us. It is plain, straightforward, and easy ; and we do not feel equal to the windings, obscurities, and asperities of a new and unbeaten path. Bold, energetic, young men, strong minds, full of spirit, untamed by experience, buoyant, confident in themselves, may laugh at us, and say we have grown weary and faint-hearted ; but they will not move us. We have been of their number, and laughed as they laugh, as heartily, and as proudly, and we can afford to be laughed at. Alas ! we know what their laughter is worth, and — what it costs. We have said all they can say. We have eaten our own words. May they live long enough to eat theirs, and to become ashamed of their mockery, as we are of ours.

ART. VI. — LITERARY NOTICES AND MISCELLANIES.

1. — *The Primacy of the Apostolic See vindicated.* By FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK, Bishop of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Fithian. 1845. 8vo. pp. 488.

THE high literary reputation and distinguished abilities of its right reverend author, are a sufficient guaranty of the interest, value, and importance of this work. So far as we have read, we have found the argument clear and conclusive, conducted with rare erudition, and in a gentle, meek, and truly Christian temper. We thank the author for his work, and assure him that he has made an important contribution to the literature of the Church in this country. His work was much needed, especially for English readers, and at the present time, when the Papacy is so violently and so ignorantly assailed. Indeed, it is the only work in English, with which we are acquainted, in which the question of the Primacy of the Apostolic See, with its collateral questions, is fully, comprehensively, and yet briefly, discussed. Till its appearance, we knew of no English work which we could put into the hands of those desirous of giving the subject a full and impartial investigation. It will, therefore, supply a want which many have felt.

It would be presumptuous in us to speak of the doctrines set forth in this book, either to commend or to censure. The layman, because an editor or reviewer, is not relieved from his obligation to submit to his spiritual superiors, or to learn his faith from those the Holy Ghost has set in the Church to teach and to rule the flock. Yet, on matters of private opinion, each man, whether layman or not, may entertain and express, reverently, his own opinions. We need not say we have been highly delighted as well as instructed by Bishop Kenrick's work, and especially with that portion which explains the connexion which formerly existed between the Papal chair and the several civil governments of Christian Europe. He has ably and successfully vindicated the Popes from the charges usually brought against them, and showed that the Popes were very far from encroaching, or attempting to encroach, on the rights of civil governments and sovereign princes. And yet, he will forgive us, if we say we wish he had done this in a bolder tone. It is true, the connexion of the ecclesiastical powers, which formerly existed in Europe, is not necessary to the Church, not an essential element of its constitution, not by any means an article of faith; but that connexion, growing up as it did out of the circumstances of the time, was productive of the greatest good, and Europe has gained nothing by dissolving it. At any rate, it is not a connexion to be apologized for, nor which

the Catholic should regret. Few men better deserve the reverence of mankind than the Gregories and the Innocents; and the rapid progress of despotism throughout Europe, in proportion as the authority of the Holy See has been weakened, affords matter of serious meditation to all the lovers of liberty and liberal institutions.

For ourselves, we do not regard with the same feelings as do some, even of our Catholic brethren, the charges brought by Protestants against the Popes. And we are very far from wishing, in order to escape those charges, to restrict the Papal power as much as possible. We have, of course, no reference in this remark to the right reverend author of the work before us. But we fancy we witness among some of our Catholic brethren a disposition to concede far more to Protestant prejudice and cant than is necessary. The violence with which the Papacy is assailed is a proof of its utility, as well as of its divine institution, and should make it as dear to the statesman as to the Catholic. This inveterate hostility, which for so many ages has been manifested against it, proves that it stands in the way of tyrants and of lawless passion; that it is, in fact, a shield interposed between the many and the ambitious few, between the masses and their oppressors. This we saw, and this we stated in our publications and lectures, long before we became a Catholic, and when hardly less prejudiced against the Church than are the majority of our countrymen. We confess that the clamor of our countrymen against "the Pope," "the authority of the Pope," "allegiance to the Pope," and "the intention of the Pope to possess himself of this country," does not move us. The Church is of God, and the Papacy is essential to the constitution and existence of the Church. This is our answer to all clamors.

"But would you have this country come under the authority of the Pope?" Why not? "But the Pope would take away our free institutions!" Nonsense. But how do you know that? From what do you infer it? After all, do you not commit a slight blunder? Are your free institutions infallible? Are they founded on divine right? This you deny. Is not the proper question for you to discuss, then, not, whether the Papacy be or be not compatible with republican government, but, whether it be or be not founded in divine right? If the Papacy be founded in divine right, it is supreme over whatever is founded only in human right, and then your institutions should be made to harmonize with it, not it with your institutions. And this would be cause of no apprehension for liberty, for liberty consists in the supremacy of the divine over the human; and we know that no evil can come from the divine supremacy. The real question, then, is, not the compatibility or incompatibility of the Catholic Church with democratic institutions, but, Is the Catholic Church the Church of God? Settle

this question first. But, in point of fact, democracy is a mischievous dream, wherever the Catholic Church does not predominate, to inspire the people with reverence, and to teach and accustom them to obedience to authority. The first lesson for all to learn, the last that should be forgotten, is, TO OBEY. You can have no government, where there is no obedience; and obedience to law, as it is called, will not long be enforced, where the fallibility of law is clearly seen and freely admitted, and especially where the law changes with every year, or is every year in need of amendment. Reverence for law is in our country already down to the freezing-point, and threatens to fall to zero, and lower. Very few of our countrymen look upon obedience to law as a moral duty. While such is our moral state, it is idle to talk of civil freedom. We have already the germs of anarchy, which events may not be slow to develope and mature. If we love freedom (since freedom is impossible without a well ordered government, without the supremacy of law), we cannot but seek the predominance of the Catholic Church, for no other can teach and produce due reverence and obedience. Under the supremacy of the Catholic Church, through its moral and spiritual influences, liberty may be a reality, and democracy not a delusive dream.

But "It is the intention of the Pope to possess this country." Undoubtedly. "In this intention he is aided by the Jesuits, and all the Catholic prelates and priests." Undoubtedly, if they are faithful to their religion. "If the Catholic Church becomes predominant here, Protestants will all be exterminated." We hope so, if exterminated *as Protestants* by being converted to the Catholic faith; not otherwise. We would exterminate error everywhere, by converting its subjects to the truth, — by moral, not by physical force. This kind of extermination our Protestant brethren are to dread, but no other. The Church never uses physical force; her weapons are spiritual, not carnal. Yet Protestantism will find them none the less powerful on that account. Before the state, so far as the action of civil government is concerned, the Church permits all men, whatever the form of their faith or worship, to have equal rights; but before herself, before the spiritual tribunal, she knows and can know no toleration of error. She therefore does, and must, labor incessantly — and the Pope, as head of the Church — to root out all error, and to bring all to the belief and profession of the true faith. That to do this, by all spiritual and moral means, is the settled policy of the Church, is unquestionably true. That this policy is dreaded and opposed, and must be dreaded and opposed, by all Protestants, infidels, demagogues, tyrants, and oppressors, is also unquestionably true. Save, then, in the discharge of our civil duties, and in the ordinary business of life, there is, and can be, no harmony between Catholics and Protestants. The two parties stand opposed,

separated, not by a mere paper wall, as some of the sects are, but by a great gulf. In civil and domestic peace, Catholics and Protestants may dwell together; in other respects, there is, and can be, no union among them. The people of Christ are a peculiar people; they stand out from the world, distinct, separate,—and must, if they will be the people of Christ. They can have no fellowship with Belial, nor live in peace and harmony with his children. They must be meek, gentle, forbearing, returning always good for evil, blessing for cursing; but they are to stand on true Catholic ground, and never yield even one hair's breadth.

No matter what taunts may be uttered, what falsehoods propagated, about foreign allegiance, and all that. Let these falsehoods go; they are not worth contradicting. Above all, in their eagerness to contradict them, Catholics must not suffer themselves to be betrayed into statements which would restrict the ecclesiastical authority—nay, the Papal authority—further than the Divine constitution of the Church, and its free, unimpeded action will admit. The Papal authority, all know, does not extend to civil matters, save by ordinance and consent of civil governments themselves; but all matters are so mixed up in this life, and all here is so subordinated to the great ends of our existence hereafter, that it is not in all cases easy to draw the line, nor prudent to be over-particular in saying where the spiritual authority begins or ends. Submission in doubtful cases is better than resistance, and individuals in their haste are full as likely to encroach on authority, as the Pope is to encroach on liberty. The calamities which have afflicted the Church have all come from the effort to destroy its independence, to curtail its rightful authority, and to subject it to the civil power. The complete independence of the spiritual authority, its perfect freedom from all dependence on the civil authority, is the motto of every enlightened friend of religion and of religious liberty.

But we are exceeding our limits, and straying from the work before us. They who wish to see the Primacy of the Apostolic See ably and triumphantly vindicated, and the action of the Papal authority over modern civilization clearly set forth and dispassionately considered, will find this volume the very one they need. We commend it to the serious study of our Protestant brethren. Its study may teach them some things they are slow to learn, still slower to believe.

2. — *Historical Sketch of O'Connell and his Friends, with a Glance at the Future Destiny of Ireland.* By THOMAS D. MCGEE. Boston: Donahue & Rohan. 1845. 12mo. pp. 208.

THIS is an interesting and eloquently written work, by the talented editor of the *Boston Pilot*, and dedicated especially to the citizens of this country who are of Irish descent. It evinces more than ordinary literary ability on the part of its author, as well as a heart tenderly alive to the political interests of Ireland. We might take some exceptions to the work, were we disposed to be very critical. The praise bestowed is laid on rather too thick to suit our taste, and the censures upon those the author does not chance to like are quite too bitter. When the author shall have lived some years longer, he will learn that no man is so good as he is represented to be, and no man so bad. His praise of O'Connell is unbounded, and yet, we are obliged to confess, his work has not tended to exalt O'Connell in our estimation. If an enemy had told us that Daniel O'Connell could ever have so far compromised his principles, as, for any purpose whatever, to have drunk "The pious and immortal memory of William of Orange," we should have pronounced it a slander. Mr. McGee must allow us also to say, that, considering he is a resident, if not a citizen, of this country, as this is his home, and the sphere of his labors, the whole tone and sentiment of his work are too foreign, especially as intended for American citizens. We find no fault with him for his devotion to Ireland. Nay, we honor him for this devotion. We ask not that our Irish fellow-citizens should forget their fatherland; we are willing, nay, we wish that they should retain for it the warmest affections of the heart; but we do ask them to remember that they have not brought Ireland with them to the land of their adoption. In these times, when so violent hostility is excited against foreigners, and against Catholic Irishmen in particular, those who write books or conduct newspapers should be careful not to write or say aught gratuitously that may tend to increase this hostility. No small portion of this hostility itself is produced by the forgetfulness of those who conduct the Irish press in this country, that native Americans have sensibilities as well as Irishmen. We speak plainly, but not unkindly. Attached to Ireland by our religion, by our own Irish blood, and by our sympathy with her wrongs and sufferings, which have been so great that we have never been able to read the full history of them, we are not afraid of being misconstrued, or of giving the tenderest Irish sensibility the least offence. Irishmen in this country have a double duty, — a duty to the country they have left, and a duty to the country they have adopted. We say not that they are wanting in their duty to the country of their adoption; but we do say, some of their

writers — and we cannot except our young friend, the author of the work before us, conducting one of the leading Irish journals in this country — manifest an unnecessary forgetfulness of the fact that they are writing for American citizens, and show occasionally an offensive want of respect for American feelings. The Irish Americans constitute a large and an important portion of our population. We welcome them, and we wish them to find here a home, a home which they may enjoy in peace and quietness. We wish no distinction to be made between the native-born and the foreign-born, between the descendants of Irish parents and the descendants of English, Scotch, French, or German parents; and we are confident no distinction would be made, if our Irish fellow-citizens did not themselves make it. But enough of this.

In the effort of O'Connell and his friends to emancipate Ireland, we need not say we take the deepest interest. Ireland has suffered more than any other people. The history of her wrongs is the blackest chapter in the history of the human race, and terrible vengeance will one day be wreaked on England and England's Church; for there is a God in heaven, who will avenge the wronged. So far as the work before us shall tend to excite sympathy with the great movement at the head of which stands Daniel O'Connell, and which owes not less to the Catholic bishops and clergy of Ireland than to him, — and so far as it shall tend to enlist the exertions of all the friends of suffering humanity everywhere, we hail it with pleasure, and cordially thank the author for his labors, and the present he has made us and the public. We ardently desire to see Ireland's wrongs redressed, and Ireland a free, independent, and prosperous nation; and, if we do not shout "Repeal" as loudly as some of our friends, it is because we have done taking any very active part in political movements, whether at home or abroad. To us, the emancipation of the soul is a greater object than the emancipation of the state; and to secure the blessings of the world to come is much more important than merely to secure the blessings of political and social liberty here. We honor the Irish for their spirited efforts to regain their national existence and rank; we honor them still more for having for these three hundred years suffered every indignity, privation, and distress, rather than abandon the faith transmitted to them from their fathers. We sympathize with all who struggle to secure to the people their rights; we wish them success; but the remainder of our life must be spent in the effort to promote the welfare of the people by doing what we can to recall them to the true Catholic faith, and to persuade them to seek *first* the kingdom of God and his justice. The author of the book under consideration claims to be a Catholic. He must pardon us for saying that we have detected in his book several trains of thought and expressions, which we were familiar with before we became a Catholic, but which we

have not been accustomed to find in Catholic writers. We for ourselves can hardly consent to call the *Revolt of Islam* one of "the literary works which have illuminated the nineteenth century," the light of which is the darkness of infidelity. But enough of fault-finding. We, notwithstanding the exceptions we have taken, prize Mr. McGee's book very highly. It has interested and instructed us. We assure the author that we shall always hail his literary success with pleasure, and that, if true to his country, his Church, and his faith, his continued success is certain, and an honorable fame awaits him.

3. — *The Written Word and the Living Witness: or Bible Question fairly tested.* New-York : Casserly & Sons. 1844. 16mo. pp. 203.

THIS little volume consists of three tracts. The first, on the use of the Bible, by Fenelon, with illustrations by Rev. John Fletcher, D. D. The second is the celebrated pastoral charge of the Archbishop of Tours on the authority of the Church to interpret the Scriptures: the third is an article from the *Dublin Review*, on Protestant evidences of Catholicity, by Dr. Julius V. Höninghaus. The three together make a very interesting and valuable volume, which we commend to the serious attention of those who feel interested in the "Bible question," and have so much to say about keeping "the word of God from the people." As Fenelon is a great favorite with many Protestants, they may perhaps pay some attention to his statements. The article from the *Dublin Review* will afford them a lucid commentary on their doctrine of the sufficiency of private reason as the interpreter of the word of God.

We intended to discuss the Bible question at length in this number of our Review, but we have filled up our space with discussions which we considered more immediately interesting. Those who regret this are referred to the little volume before us.

4. — *Saint Ignatius and his First Companions.* By the REV. CHARLES CONSTANTINE PISE, D. D. New-York : Edward Dunnigan. 1845. 12mo. pp. 361.

A WORK finely printed and neatly done up, written in a style of great elegance and classical purity, on a subject that must make the coldest heart beat quick, and the dullest tongue grow eloquent.

Dr. Pise has done the cause of truth great service in publishing this work on Saint Ignatius and his first companions. It is well to let the public know somewhat of the character of the founder of the so much decried order of the Jesuits, and especially at this time, when the enemies of the Church at home and abroad are, if possible, fiercer than ever against them. All we ask of those who speak against the Jesuits is to read this book, and if they do not discover the clear and unmistakable marks of Divine interposition in establishing the Society of Jesus, they have a much duller vision than we have hitherto given them credit for. The obligations of the world to this truly Christian society are not easily told; but their deeds, their sufferings, their sacrifices, in the name of Jesus and for the greater glory of God, are registered where only they have cared to have them known; and they will be known one day to all the world, to the confusion of their revilers.

5. — *A complete System of Latin Prosody, for the Use of Schools, Colleges, and private Learners, on a Plan entirely new.* By PATRICK S. CASSERLY. New-York: Casserly & Sons. 1845. pp. 144.

WE can cheerfully recommend this work to all who wish to become acquainted with Latin Prosody. It is a work of great merit, and cannot fail to be of great utility to all Latin students.

6. — *The Life of Godfrey William Von Leibnitz, on the Basis of the German Work of Dr. G. E. Guhrauer.* By JOHN M. MACKIE. Boston: Gould, Kendall, & Lincoln. 1845. 16mo. pp. 288.

WE intend returning to this work and its subject hereafter, and therefore only add now that the work is readable, and, in the main, may be relied on.

7. — *The Beechen Tree. A Tale told in Rhyme.* By F. W. THOMAS, Author of "Clinton Bradshaw," etc. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1844. 12mo. pp. 95.

WE rarely read poetry in these days, still more rarely our Amer-

ican poets. We have a horror of all writing where every line begins with a capital letter. But we have read this poem, and with a good deal of interest and pleasure. The author has true poetic feeling and expression, and, did we not make it a rule never to commend a poem that sings of love, we would commend it to our readers. The tale, however, has a moral, and one that is worth learning.

8. — *The Holy Bible translated from the Vulgate, diligently compared with the Hebrew, Greek, and other Editions, in divers Languages; the Old Testament first published by the English College at Douay, 1609, and the New Testament at Rheims, 1582.* New-York: Edward Dunnigan. 1844. 8vo.

THIS is one of the best editions of the Bible ever published in this country. It is printed on excellent paper, on a type remarkable for its clearness and beauty, and is of a convenient size for a family Bible. The illustrations are appropriate, and of great artistic merit. Upon the whole, considering its low price, its convenient size, its typographical beauty, and the worth of its illustrations, it is the most desirable edition of the Holy Bible in English that can be obtained. We are happy also to learn that the publisher has found it quite successful, notwithstanding it is said Catholics are not allowed to keep or read the word of God.

9. — *The Sinner's Guide.* By REV. F. LEWIS, of Grenada. Translated from the Spanish. Philadelphia: Henry McGrath. 1845. 8vo. pp. 400.

THIS work, judging from what little we have read of it, and from the high reputation it bears, is a work of great value, and worthy to be owned and read daily by every one who aspires to Christian perfection. We regret that our own personal acquaintance with the ascetic books of the Church is so limited. Till within a year, we had never read half a dozen Catholic books in our life, of any kind, dogmatic, polemical, or ascetic. It seems to us now, that all our life and study prior to our conversion to the Catholic faith was thrown away. Every day we find new treasures in Catholic literature of which we had no suspicion, and he who has once begun to taste the riches of this literature can no longer relish the Protestant; and in nothing can this be said with more truth than in refer-

ence to the Catholic ascetic literature. The ascetic books of Protestants are cold and formal, dull and repulsive. They have nothing of the unction of the spirit. They are unspiritual and spiritless. They make virtue repulsive, hateful. Our Catholic ascetic writers, on the contrary, though stricter than Protestants, yet make virtue amiable, and while they hold up the cross to us, make us embrace it with affection. We commend this book, not only to all who are desirous of leading a holy life, but to all those Protestants who fancy the Catholic religion is a religion of mere forms.

- 10.—*The Arguments of the Romanists, from the Infallibility of the Church and the Testimony of the Fathers, in Behalf of the Apocrypha, discussed and refuted.* By JAMES H. THORNWELL, Professor of Sacred Literature and the Evidences of Christianity in South Carolina College. New-York: Leavitt, Trow, & Co. 1845. 16mo. pp. 417.

THIS work was sent to us by an esteemed friend in South Carolina, with the request that we would give it a thorough review. Although a reply to it may be expected from the Rev. Dr. Lynch of Charleston, S. C., against whom it is especially directed, we hope to be able to comply with the request of our friend in our next number. We are told the work is considered by the Presbyterians in South Carolina to be a great affair. We have read the book. It is Presbyterian from beginning to end, breathes the true John Knox spirit. The author, if he have not the spirit of Christian love, has at least its opposite, and is a most hearty hater. He has annexed two pages of *errata*; if he had annexed some two or three hundred pages, he would still have left in no small number of "typographical errors" to be corrected by the reader.

* * MR. CLERKENWELL not having forwarded his manuscript of the continuation of Edward Morton in season for the present number, the story will not be continued in the Review; but will be put to press as a separate work, in two volumes, 12mo., as soon as it is possible for the author to get it ready. We do not much regret this, because our readers may then have it all at once, and because other matters are so multiplying on our hands that we have hardly room for it in our Review.